

MAY 10 '37

0

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October, the last issue being a double number; the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

EDITED BY

M. PLATNAUER, M.A., B.Litt., Brasenose College, Oxford.

B. L. HALLWARD, M.A., Peterhouse, Cambridge.

Board of Management:

Prof. D. B. ROBERTSON, M.A., *Chairman, representing the Cambridge Philological Society.*

J. G. BARRINGTON-WARD, M.A. (*Hon. Treas.*)

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A.

Prof. H. A. ORMEROD, M.A.

F. H. SANDRACH, M.A.

Prof. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A.

Representing the Council of the Classical Association.

E. A. BARBER, M.A. (*Hon. Secretary*), *representing the Oxford Philological Society.*

With the co-operation of Prof. TENNEY FRANK, Johns Hopkins University, Prof. E. K. RAND, Harvard University, and Prof. W. J. WOODHOUSE, Sydney University.

Vol. XXXI.

APRIL, 1937

No. 2

CONTENTS

	PAGES
NOTE ON VERGIL <i>AENEID</i> VII. 376-384	GERTRUDE HIRST 65
ON THE DATE OF ANTIPHON'S FIFTH ORATION	P. S. BREUNING 67
PLATO, <i>PARMENIDES</i> 129 AND <i>REPUBLIC</i> 475-480	N. R. MURPHY 71
THE SOURCES OF DIODORUS SICULUS XVI	N. G. L. HAMMOND 79
Γυναικὸς ἀνδρὸς βουλὸν ἐλπίζον κέρ (AGAMEMNON I. 11)	W. BEDELL STANFORD 92
THE CHORUS OF ALCMAN'S <i>PARTHENION</i>	D. L. PAGE 94
THE CAREER OF SEX. JULIUS FRONTINUS	J. B. WARD PERKINS 102
METRICAL OBSERVATIONS ON AESCH. <i>PERS.</i> 922-1001	A. M. DALE 106
THE LATIN COLONIES AT VITELLIA AND CERCEII	E. T. SALMON 111
SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS: LITERATURE AND GENERAL	114
LANGUAGE	127

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price for single numbers, 4/- net (4/2 post free); for double numbers, 8/- net (8/4 post free). Yearly Subscription 16/- post free; U.S.A. \$4. Combined Yearly Subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25/- post free; U.S.A. \$8.25.

MACMILLAN

INDEX TO 'THE PALACE OF MINOS'

By JOAN EVANS, D.Litt. With Special Sections classified in detail and chronologically arranged by Sir ARTHUR EVANS, D.Litt., F.R.S., F.B.A. Crown 4to. 31s. 6d. net.

Sir Arthur Evans hopes that this volume will be of use, not only to purchasers of 'The Palace of Minos,' but also to many students, unable to afford the work, who need a private key for reference to copies in public libraries and institutions.

AUGUSTUS CAESAR: A Personal Study

By BERNARD M. ALLEN, M.A., LL.D., author of 'Gordon and the Sudan,' etc. With a Frontispiece. 8s. 6d. net.

This book is published in anticipation of the celebration next autumn of the bi-millenary of the birth of Augustus. It presents a picture of the Emperor himself, and shows how he rose to be the greatest figure in the world of his day.

Translations by Dr. Arthur S. Way

CATULLUS AND TIBULLUS IN ENGLISH VERSE. 2s. 6d. net.

THE ODES OF HORACE: A Literal Translation. 2s. 6d. net.

THE SCIENCE OF DINING (Mensa Philosophica): A Medieval Treatise on the Hygiene of the Table and the Laws of Health. 3s. 6d. net.

MACMILLAN & CO., LTD., ST. MARTIN'S STREET, LONDON, W.C. 2

ALBINUS

and the History of Middle Platonism

By R. E. WITT 7s. 6d. net

Cambridge Classical Studies

This is the first exhaustive examination of the *Didaskalikos* of Albinus. This epitome of Plato is carefully considered as a typical product of "Middle Platonism," and its relations, both to the relevant philosophies of the pre-Christian era and to the Neoplatonism of Plotinus, are investigated.

ROMAN SATIRE

Its Outlook on Social Life

By J. WIGHT DUFF 10s. 6d. net

The Sather Classical Lectures, 1936

Contents: Satire Ancient and Modern; Greek Precursors of Roman Satire—*and Ennius; Lucilius, Creator of the Roman Type; Horace; Menippean Satire—Varro, Seneca, Petronius; Phaedrus and Persius—Beast Fable and Stoic Homily; Martial—The Epigram as Satire; Juvenal and Other Satirists; Notes; Index.*

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

≡

and
A.

of
who

etc.

bi-
self,

met.

met.

A
the

C. 2

≡

≡

≡

≡

≡

≡

SSS

≡

≡

≡

≡

TH

A
describ
reading
Vergil
paragra
the Lat
in my p
and his

Mr. Gu
quotes
of Dion
Thracia

The syr

Further
Kabirol
century
'exactly
most in
offering
clay, wh

Pe
had in
and so

¹ 'An
Aeneid v
can Phil

NO. 1

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

APRIL, 1937.

NOTE ON VERGIL *AENEID* VII. 376-384.

TUM vero infelix ingentibus excita monstribus
immensam sine more furit lymphata per urbem.
ceu quondam torto volitans sub verbere turbo,
quem pueri magno in gyro vacua atria circum
intenti ludo exercent—ille actus habena
curvatis fertur spatiis; stupet inscia supra
impubesque manus mirata volubile buxum;
dant animos plagae—non cursu segnior illo
per medias urbes agitur populosque ferocis.

A long time ago, in a paper that appeared in *Class. Quart.* X (1916) 87-96,¹ I described these lines about Amata as the grotesque simile of the top. Now, since reading Mr. W. K. C. Guthrie's *Orpheus and Greek Religion*,² it appears to me that Vergil may have used the simile with a very definite reference to the context. The paragraph (lines 376-405) describes Amata's Bacchic frenzy as she leads Lavinia and the Latin women through the mountains, crying 'capite *orgia* mecum,' which I took in my paper as a reminiscence of Catullus 64. 251 sqq.—the description of Bacchus and his followers, especially noting lines 259-60

pars obscura cavis celebrabant *orgia* cistis,
orgia, quae frustra cupiunt audire profani.

Mr. Guthrie, in chapter iv, 'The Creation and the Gods as Presented by Orpheus,' quotes (pages 120 ff.) the passage from Clement of Alexandria³ about the mysteries of Dionysus and his childish playthings. 'The poet of the mysteries, Orpheus the Thracian, says:

Tops of different sorts and jointed dolls, and fair
golden apples from the clear-voiced Hesperides.*

The symbols in this mystery are purposeless objects.'

*κῶνος καὶ ῥόμβος καὶ παίγνια καμπεσίγνια,
μῆλ' αὖτε χρύσεια καλὰ παρ' Ἑσπερίδων λιγυφώνων.

Further on Mr. Guthrie gives an account of the excavation of the sanctuary of the Kabiroi at Thebes in Boiotia, with a reproduction of a vase painting of the fourth century B.C., showing the Child, and the reclining figure of the Kabiros, which 'exactly resembles Dionysus as he is depicted on vases of Attic style.' But 'the most interesting part of the discoveries comes now. Among the heaps of votive offerings found in the shrine were a number of objects, some in bronze and some in clay, which are unmistakably spinning tops.' In Fig. 13 one of these is given.

Perhaps then Vergil in this passage about the Dionysiac mysteries may have had in mind the fact that a top was one of the sacred objects (*orgia*) in these mysteries, and so for that reason have deliberately used this simile, which has been a sore trial

¹ 'An Attempt to Date the Composition of *Aeneid* vii' (read at the meeting of the American Philological Association at Haverford Col-

lege, Dec. 30, 1914).

² Methuen, London, 1935.

³ *Protr.* 2. 17. 2-18 = O.F. 34.

to his editors. Conington's note on vii. 378 is 'Heyne thinks it certain that this simile is taken from some lost Greek poet, a singular way of vindicating Virg.'s taste at the expense of his originality. The "turbo" or "turben" (top) was the Greek *ρόμβος* or *βέμβιξ*.' Sidgwick, in the Introduction to his edition of *Aeneid* vii, says 'The triviality and inappropriateness of the simile is here almost grotesque, and strongly inclines one to think with Heyne that the passage must be an imitation. So an attempt to justify Vergil's use of the top seems not uncalled for.

Mr. A. S. F. Gow's paper 'Ἰνγξ, *ρόμβος*, rhombus, turbo' (*Journ. Hell. Stud.* Vol. 54, 1934, pp. 1-13), to which Mr. Guthrie refers, is not mainly concerned with tops, but he says that *κῶνος* seems to mean top, and that *ἰμᾶσι τύπτοντες* of *Et. Mag.* 706 and the Scholiast on *Ap. Rhod.* i. 1139 may have a reference to this sense of *ρόμβος* which is equated with *κῶνος* in the Clement of Alexandria passage. Vergil's line 380 gives very well the sense of *ἰμᾶσι τύπτοντες* (quem pueri . . .)

intenti ludo exercent ; ille actus habena.

BARNARD COLLEGE,
COLUMBIA UNIV., N.Y., U.S.A.

GERTRUDE HIRST.

ON

ANT
several so
the revol
declares
going int
accused n
in the δαί
we were
time—he
to pay th
nesses.—
harbour i
changed ;
chance :
on his ov
Ainos ; o
And again
trickery o
we had be
that was
other ship
but did no
he had dis
strange to
sent to M
own servi
might hav
nor anyw
putting ou
So far
everything
had an al
accuse th
themselve
would hav
some ulter
which it w
ἡ πᾶσα παρ
assertion,
reasons for

In §
Ainos at th
¹ τὸ πλοῖον
is not ment
ever, forget
at the ἀνάγκη
² Another
to Athens v

ON THE DATE OF ANTIPHON'S FIFTH ORATION.

ANTIPHON'S speech on the murder of Herodes has been variously dated by several scholars, but all seem to agree that it was delivered a good many years after the revolt and recapture of Mytilene. According to this opinion the speaker in § 74 declares himself too young to know much of what happened in those days. Before going into this more carefully, it seems necessary to visualize the situation of the accused man. In order to achieve this the best we can do is to follow his own words in the *δίκη*, §§ 20-24: 'I travelled from Mytilene on the same ship as the lost man; we were on our journey to Ainos, I to see my father—he happened to be there at that time—he in order to sell some slaves to Thracian natives. These natives, who were to pay the ransom, and the slaves were on board too.—All this I will prove by witnesses.—As we, however, met with stormy weather, we were compelled to put in to a harbour in the territory of Methymna; there we found that¹ ship into which Herodes changed; in that ship, according to the accusers, he died. Now all this was mere chance: obviously I had not persuaded him to travel with me, no, he was travelling on his own business. Then I, personally, had a very good reason for travelling to Ainos; our putting in to that harbour was not premeditated, we were compelled to. And again, when we were lying at anchor, the change of ship took place without any trickery or fraud: again, it was done because of necessity. The ship, viz., on which we had been travelling was not covered, the other one on the contrary had a covering; that was because of the rain.—All this I will prove by witnesses.—After boarding the other ship we drank some wine. After that it is only known that he left the ship, but did not return. I myself never left the ship that night at all. When the next day he had disappeared, we looked for him, I as well as the others. Probably it seemed strange to them, it certainly did to me. And it was I who caused a messenger to be sent to Mytilene, not one of the crew or the passengers belonging to Herodes, but my own servant. If I had been guilty, I would not, of course, have sent a man who might have informed against me. But when the man could not be found in Mytilene, nor anywhere else, and when the weather had improved and all the other ships were putting out, I also sailed.—All this I will prove by witnesses.'

So far the *δίκη*, which, I think, we may quite well believe to be true, as everything it contains is proved by witnesses.² In other words, the accused man had an alibi. Why then did the lost man's relations (§ 59 *τῶν ἐκείνου ἀναγκαίων*) accuse the speaker, and that in such an unusual way? Unusual, because if they themselves had been convinced that the man was the murderer, they undoubtedly would have brought the charge before the *βασιλεὺς*. They must, therefore, have had some ulterior reason, and the speaker supplies us with an answer as to the question which it was: they wanted his money (§§ 10, 59 and especially 79 *χρημάτων γὰρ ἕνεκα ἢ πᾶσα παρασκευὴ γέγνηται ἐπ' ἐμοὶ κακείνῳ*). This, of course, is only the defendant's assertion, and it might be nothing but his counter-attack. But he had, I think, good reasons for emphasising this point so much.

In § 20 he states that he was going to see his father, who 'happened to be at Ainos at that time.' Now this really is an understatement: in § 78 we read that his

¹ τὸ πλοῖον τοῦτο seems a little surprising, as it is not mentioned earlier. We must not, however, forget that the judges had heard about it at the *ἀνάκρισις*.

² Another point in his favour is that he went to Athens voluntarily to defend himself. If he

had committed murder, he would, to my mind, not have risked so great a danger. On the other hand he must have thought his opponents' position weak, as they wavered in their assertions as to how the murder actually happened, § 29.

father preferred¹ to stay at Ainos. Why? We need not look far for the cause. We are told (§ 76) that at the time of the insurrection the father could not leave Mytilene, as he was kept there by his children and his property. The end of the next paragraph gives us a clue to the nature of this property: it was land.² In other words he had been a landed proprietor and belonged to the upper class without exactly being an oligarch, which would undoubtedly have cost him his life. On the contrary it is expressly stated that he disapproved of the behaviour of his fellow-citizens, and sympathized with the Athenians (§ 76). Nevertheless he must have found it hard to pay rent as a tenant on land which formerly he used to call his own. Possibly he showed his feelings too clearly to the new owners,³ so that in due time he had to leave the place in order to avoid further difficulties. It even seems possible that the poor man provoked the Athenian democrats by the conscientious way in which he fulfilled all his duties towards the state (§ 77).

It is not by mere chance that he then went to Ainos. This town on the Thracian coast at the mouth of the Hebros also belonged to the Athenian Empire,⁴ but originally was an Aeolic settlement from Alopekonnos. Later new colonists were sent there from Mytilene.⁵ It seems likely that our defendant's father possessed some other properties there, and that there he felt safe after the trouble on his native island.

In this way he had frustrated his enemies, who now tried to attack him in some other way. The disappearance of their relation Herodes⁶ and the circumstance of their enemy's son travelling with him on the same ship proved a most opportune weapon, by which they could wound the islander in his tenderest spot: they knew that if they accused the young man of being the cause of Herodes' disappearance, he as a Mytilenean before an Athenian court might easily be convicted. By bringing him before the *ἡλιασταί* they might quite well achieve a double aim: first the chance of a conviction was greater than if he had appeared before the Areopagus, whose members would not so easily be influenced by political feeling,⁷ and secondly by applying the *ἀπαγωγή*, i.e. prosecuting him by means of a *δίκη ἰδία*, they might obtain damages.⁸

Only when visualizing this lawsuit against such a background do we fully understand the young man's difficult position, and at the same time we see that he was quite justified in accusing his opponents of trying to rob him of his money. The whole accusation was nothing but a case of *συκοφαντία*, of which especially citizens of the allied states were so often the victims.⁹ But he uses the word *συκοφάντης* very sparingly and only rather indirectly, §§ 78 and 80.¹⁰ He had very good reason for such caution, as at the time of speaking the relations were strained between the Athenian democrats and the class of Mytileneans to which the defendant belonged.

What, then, was the time of speaking?

¹ On the word *χωροφιλεῖν* see *Donum Natalicium Schrijnen* 1929 pp. 656 ff.

² *τέλη κατατίθουσιν*, he pays the rent on the land, which had been confiscated by the Athenians after the suppression of the revolt, cf. Boeckh *Staatshaushaltung* I³ p. 586.

³ The cleruchs probably were the soldiers who had suppressed the rebellion, see Ed. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums* IV p. 347: 'Die Ansiedler blieben jedoch in den Städten als Garnison concentrirt.'

⁴ Its name appears in several tribute lists, see Index of *I.G.* I³.

⁵ Cf. Herod. VII 58 and Strabo frg. 52 p. 331 (Kramer II p. 88).

⁶ Probably Herodes was drowned by accident under the influence of too much wine, § 26 *μεθύ-*

οντος τοῦ ἀνδρός.

⁷ Cf. Aristot. 'A. II. 3. 6 ἡ γὰρ αἰρεσις τῶν ἀρχόντων ἀριστινὴν καὶ πλουτίνην ἦν, ἐξ ὧν οἱ Ἀρεοπαγῖται καθίσταντο and Philoch. frg. 58 FHG (quoted by Sandys ad I.) οὐ πάντως ἀνδρὸς ἦν εἰς τὴν ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλήν τελειν· ἀλλ' οἱ παρ' Ἀθηναίους πρωτεύοντες ἐν τε γένει καὶ πλούτῳ καὶ βίῳ χρηστῶ.

⁸ Cf. § 10 *ἐπεὶ τμήσιν μοι ἐποίησαν.*

⁹ Cf. Neil ad *Aristoph. Equ.* 347 (metics) and 839/40, and *Aristoph. Pac.* 639/40 (Maetzner ad *Antiph.* VI 43):

τῶν δὲ συμμάχων ἔσειον τοὺς παχείς καὶ πλουσίους, αἰτίας δὲ προστίθεντες, ὥς φρονεῖ τὰ Βρασιδίου.

¹⁰ Compare the much more outspoken challenge of the defendant in VI 43, who is an Athenian himself.

Alth
of § 78,
that par
words ὡ
ἡμετέροις
'he may
towards
have, wh
words m
to his au

If w
In the fi
its gener
posing o
i.e. Asia
There it
mentio
Thucydi
who are
open ho
ἡμετέροι
Pelopon
delivered
resumed
by Athe
confined
in Sicily
Then Le
Thuc. V
During t
to have
years be
And the
τὰ ἐν τῇ
'Ἀθηναίων
but it wa
with wha
ὀρμώμενοι
αὐτόθεν
προδοσίαν
ἦν ποιέοι
ῥαδίως ἀπ
Ἀιολικὰ

¹ The u
does not
hand the
support R
see Thalhe
² Maetz
157e (158a
Xen. Hall.
³ Cp. Ed
on this pag
⁴ Hostili

Although much ingenuity has been spent on the rather uncertain readings of § 78, nobody as far as I know seems to have made use of a valuable indication in that paragraph, the reading of which is sufficiently certain. I am referring to the words *ὥσπερ ἑτέροις ὁρῶ τοὺς μὲν εἰς τὴν ἡπειρον ἰόντας καὶ οἰκούντας ἐν τοῖς πολεμίοις τοῖς ἡμετέροις*. The context is this: the speaker defending his father's behaviour says: 'he may prefer to live at Ainos, but by doing so he does not neglect any of his duties towards the state, nor has he become a citizen of another state, as I see other people have, who go across to the mainland and live amongst your enemies.' These last words must refer to some historical fact which was well known and very unpleasant to his audience. Is it also known to us?

If we are to ascertain this, a careful examination of the words quoted is needed.¹ In the first place the meaning of *ἡπειρος*. That the word cannot mean 'continent' in its general sense is proved by § 52, where the speaker mentions two possibilities of disposing of his supposed accomplices, either by taking them to Ainos or to the *ἡπειρος*, i.e. Asia Minor. But many instances in Thucydides make this meaning even clearer. There it nearly always means the strip of mainland coast which is opposite an island, mentioned in the context. It goes without saying that this use is not especially Thucydidean, but belongs to general usage.² In the second place the word *πολέμιοι*: who are meant? They cannot be the Persians, as the king of Persia did not actually open hostilities till a much later date, viz. in the year 413.³ Moreover the word *ἡμετέροις* would forbid such an interpretation. The only alternative left is that the Peloponnesians or their allies are referred to. This implies that the speech was delivered either some time before the peace of Nicias or after the war had been resumed.⁴ I will examine the second possibility first. When Sparta, exasperated by Athenian provocation, at last recommenced war, the scene of hostilities was confined to the Western part of the Greek world, and it was only after the disaster in Sicily that a general revolt, fanned, of course, by Sparta, spread in the Aegean. Then Lesbos and the coast opposite play their part in the intrigues of the war, see Thuc. VIII 108. But this occurred after the revolution of the Four Hundred. During the years preceding the expedition to Sicily this part of the Greek world seems to have been quite quiet.⁵ We therefore have to turn to the other possibility, i.e. to the years between the suppression of the revolt at Mytilene and the conclusion of peace. And there a remark made by Thucydides, III. 50. 3 is significant: *παρέλαβον δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ ἡπείρῳ πόλεις* ⁶ *οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ὅσων Μυτιληναῖοι ἐκράτουν, καὶ ὑπήκουον ὕστερον Ἀθηναίων*: formerly the Athenians took possession of the once Lesbian dominion, but it was some time before they had actually reduced it to submission. This agrees with what Thuc. IV. 52. 2 tells us: *καὶ οἱ Μυτιληναίων φυγάδες καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Λεσβίων, ὁρμώμενοι οἱ πολλοὶ ἐκ τῆς ἡπείρου καὶ μισθωσάμενοι ἐκ τε Πελοποννήσου ἐπικουρικὸν καὶ αὐτόθεν ξυναγείραντες, αἰροῦσι Ροιτεῖον . . . καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο ἐπὶ Ἀντανδρον στρατεύσαντες προδοσίας γενομένης λαμβάνουσι τὴν πόλιν . . . καὶ κρατυνόμενοι αὐτήν (ναὺς τε γὰρ εὐπορία ἦν ποιεῖσθαι, αὐτόθεν ξύλων ὑπαρχόντων καὶ τῆς Ἰδῆς ἐπικειμένης, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα σκευή) ῥηδίως ἀπ' αὐτῆς ὁρμώμενοι τὴν τε Λέσβον ἐγγὺς οὖσαν κακώσκειν καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ ἡπείρῳ Αἰολικὰ πόλεις χερύσσειν*. Nothing could be a better commentary on § 78 of

¹ The uncertainty of the text referred to above does not affect the argument. On the other hand the interpretation here given seems to support Reiske's, not Blass's, insertion of *τοὺς δέ*, see Thalheim's app. crit.

² Maetzner quotes Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Charm.* 157e (158a). See also Herod. I 96, 148, 171; Xen. *Hell.* III 1. 5.

³ Cp. Ed. Meyer, IV p. 555, and see also note 5 on this page.

⁴ Hostilities, of course, even after peace had

been formally concluded, never quite ceased, but their scene was the mainland of Greece, not the Aegean or the coast of Asia Minor.

⁵ Moreover from § 81, *ἀσφαλῶς διαπράσσεισθε*, it has already been deduced that the oration must be anterior to the expedition to Sicily.

⁶ IV 52. 3 these are called *Ἀκταῖαι πόλεις*, cf. *I.G.* I² 64. 91, where Antandros, Rhoiteion and other towns are mentioned under the same heading.

Antiphon's fifth speech. The πολέμοι mentioned there obviously are the 'traitors' of Antandros who together with the Lesbian exiles raised Peloponnesian mercenary troops. And we understand even better now why the accused man's father had left Lesbos: on no account would he wish to be identified with the exiles, and there was also the danger of being taken as a hostage by the infuriated Athenian garrison on the island. But his anxiety as to the outcome of his compatriots' new insurrection need not have lasted very long. Their campaign started, according to Thucydides l.c., in the spring of the year 424, probably shortly after the eclipse of the sun on March 21st of that year. But the Athenians soon put an end to it. Thuc. IV. 75. 1 relates how two Athenian admirals, who happened to be in the Hellespont region, when aware of what was going on, at once set sail, landed not far from Antandros, and with the help of an allied army defeated the rebels, after which they recaptured the town. That was in the summer of the same year, probably towards September, as in § 2 of the same chapter the author makes mention of very heavy rains, through which οὐ πολλὸν ὕστερον ten ships were lost.¹

Summing up, we may say that a *terminus post quem* and a *terminus ante quem* have been found which lie only a few months apart. The oration, therefore, must have been delivered (allowing some time for the ἀνάκρισις) in one of the summer months of the year 424.²

Can any serious objections be raised to this date? I think only one, mentioned at the outset. More than once the defendant calls his judges' attention to his youth and lack of experience. It is more especially §§ 74 and 75 which have led scholars to the supposition that the defendant at the time of the revolt of Mytilene was only a child. The evidence, however, for this theory seems rather slender, when we allow for the author's style and rhetorical exaggeration. In § 74 the words ἐγὼ δὲ πολλῷ νεώτερος τῶν ἐκείνου πεπραγμένων, which correspond with ὁ μὲν γὰρ πολλῷ πρεσβύτερός ἐστι τῶν ἐμῶν πραγμάτων, may have been used for the sake of antithesis only, as is so often the case with Antiphon. That, on the other hand, the defendant refrains from saying much on a subject which must have been painful to his audience³ is quite understandable. When, therefore, he repeats the same words in the next paragraph, they must be a rhetorical exaggeration, obvious as well as welcome to both his audience and himself. And, finally, despite his assertion to the contrary, he seems at any rate to know quite well what his father's position had been at the time of the disturbances.

P. S. BREUNING.

¹ In the same way the description of the weather in the oration §§ 21 (storm) and 22 (rain) seems to imply that the journey took place in the early spring.

² If we assume this date as being correct, the words in § 81 ἀσφαλῶς διαπράσσεσθε are indeed in agreement with the circumstances, as owing to the capture of the Spartan soldiers on Sphacteria no Peloponnesian troops were on Attic territory

and the battle of Delion did not take place till later in the year (November according to Ed. Meyer, IV p. 395).

³ He did not want to remind his judges of the cruel way the revolt had been quelled, and even less of the much worse cruelty which had been prevented in the nick of time, cp. the beginning of § 77.

PLA

Th
makes
that a f
to take
themsel
stateme
Socrate
of form
would
substan
of the la

A. Pan

To
of ques
treatme
he allow
as the c
αὐτὸ μὴ ἐ
vious a
these di
ἀπορία ἐ
The ob
known)
of exper

Th
self rea
subsequ
at all yo
credits
only to
charged
but it's
he affir
that his
Socrate
by the t
tinctnes
become
the plur
(withou
Socrate

¹ Cp. 1
view is a
probabili
ticipation
they are
intelligib

PLATO, *PARMENIDES* 129 AND *REPUBLIC* 475-480.

THE reply which Socrates makes to Zeno in the *Parmenides* and that which he makes to the φιλοθεάμονες in the *Republic* are perhaps connected chiefly by the fact that a false interpretation of either might prejudice the other, but it seems convenient to take them together for that reason even if they have not much actual connection in themselves. Both are controversial, and in the case of Socrates' reply to Zeno, no re-statement of it could be secure which did not take account of Parmenides' reply to Socrates. For if Parmenides, as is maintained by some, is not attacking the doctrine of forms as such, but only Socratic theories of their relation with particulars¹, it would be natural to think that these theories about 'participation' had been the substance of Socrates' answer to Zeno. So it is impossible to avoid some discussion of the later passage, however cursory, as a preliminary.

A. *Parmenides' Reply to Socrates.*

To believe that Parmenides, in his handling of 'participation', had no intention of questioning the real existence of separable forms themselves requires a very bold treatment of his actual statements. Certainly, when he has completed his criticism, he allows Socrates' faith in εἶδη to revive (135B), but the very form in which he states, as the converse of the previous argument, that refusal to recognize them (εἰ γὰρ τις δὴ αὐτὸ μὴ ἑάσει εἶδη τῶν ὄντων εἶναι) will have equally fatal results indicates what the previous argument had been. And the same refrain is repeated at each pause, that all these difficulties flow from the mere positing of the forms: ὁρᾷς οὖν, ὦ Σώκρατες, ὅση ἢ ἀπορία ἔάν τις εἶδη ὄντα αὐτὰ καθ' αὐτὰ διορίσῃται; (133A: similarly at 133B and 135A). The objections urged against forms in 133-134 (that even if they exist they cannot be known) seem even more plainly to apply merely to their separation from the objects of experience rather than to any special theory of their relation to them.

The very first question which Parmenides asks (130B) is whether Socrates himself really believes in separable forms, and next, what forms he believes in. His subsequent attack on 'participation' follows naturally enough; if you recognize forms at all you are bound to define their relation with particulars; inability to do so discredits them. The course of the dialogue explains why he attacks them at this stage only to posit them again (135B) as necessary for thought. In effect Socrates had charged Zeno with a lack of originality: 'You pretend to give us something new, but it's only Parmenides in disguise; you are merely denying the negative of what he affirmed.' When Zeno, who understood the charge well enough (cp. 128c), replied that his work was meant to support Parmenides rather than to improve on him, Socrates questioned its intrinsic value as a denial of pluralism, refusing to be disturbed by the thought of particular things as one and many so long as Zeno leaves the distinctness of ideal units from each other unchallenged; to prove that likeness could become unlikeness would refute Parmenides' real opponents because it would deny the plurality of forms². Thereupon Parmenides quite relevantly assails their existence (without directly considering their distinctness) and succeeds at least in convincing Socrates that he had no adequate defence of them. Primarily this appears to be a

¹ Cp. Burnet, *Greek Philosophy*, p. 254. His view is apparently based largely on historical probabilities; 'if these arguments' (about participation) 'are Eleatic in origin, it follows that they are not directed against the reality of the intelligible, but against that of the sensible.'

Professor A. E. Taylor, *Plato*, pp. 330 ff., has done much to support this view by analysis of the detail of the dialogue.

² This is the view of the passage which I am to defend later.

vindication of Zeno's method even more than of his conclusions. Socrates collapsed because he had not anticipated the objections to his own theory, and Parmenides demonstrates against him his undue depreciation of Zeno's intellectual gymnastics. Yet Zeno's conclusions have been affected to this extent, that on return to a similar thesis (137B) Parmenides treats it without the reference to particulars to which Socrates had objected. The logical effect of this is to leave the existence of forms an open question. In so far as the remainder of the dialogue takes account of Socrates' contribution it assumes either that some defence could be found against the difficulties raised by Parmenides, or that they could be avoided by some restatement of the ideal theory itself. But to enquire into the real nature of these ἀπορίαι would be outside the scope of this paper, which is only concerned with them so far as to maintain that, such as they are, they are directed against the basic truth of the theory.

B. Socrates' Reply to Zeno.

Plato seems to think the argument 'concerning the one and many' well enough known not to spend much time on making it precise. Zeno puts it forward as a *reductio ad absurdum* of the hypothesis that 'things are many', for they would become 'like and unlike'. To such paradoxes the natural answer is a defence of the validity of synthetic statement. That a subject should be both one and many, in the sense of being both white and tall, is not a contradiction. Nor does it make any difference that characters incompatible in themselves (likeness and unlikeness) be ascribed to the one subject if they belong to it in different relations, as that a man should be like Peter but unlike Paul. Contradiction is supposed to follow from the subject's partaking both in unity and multiplicity, and we have Aristotle's evidence¹ that 'the more recent of the ancients' were frightened by such puzzles into devising more than one strange kind of substitute for the natural forms of speech for fear of making the one appear many. Zeno too seems to have been holding that such cases are cases of contradiction, and as a consequence that the hypothesis of many separate things, which produced such results, can be denied.

It was therefore open for Socrates to reply that since these are not contradictions the supposed consequence does not arise. In fact (129) he seems less concerned to point out the error in the argument than its lack of novelty, but in saying that there is nothing to shock us (οὐδὲν ἀπορον οἷοι τι θαυμαστόν;) in such cases he does presumably mean that there is nothing self-contradictory in them, for self-contradiction would be shocking. No doubt Plato could not with propriety have taken this part of his reply very far, since a full treatment of these fallacies would have involved a discussion of the κοινωσίαι between εἶδη at which the young Socrates can only be allowed to hint. But that is not the end of the matter. Although the treatment of 'intermediate' being in *Republic* V (as I understand it) does not throw doubt on the existence of that of which the contraries are asserted, nor therefore on the reality of Socrates himself (who is one and many) nor of the individual substances which may be 'like and unlike', Plato does infer from such cases, without treating them as contradictions, that some particulars 'lie between being and not-being'. And even if these are not the particulars under discussion in the *Parmenides*², surely a much more thorough examination of γινόμενα and their status would have been necessary before Socrates could have

¹ *Phys.* 185B 25.

² There hardly seems to me sufficient evidence in the dialogue to be quite sure exactly what Zeno's arguments against pluralism were, nor yet what precisely Socrates meant by such remarks as οὐδὲν ἀπορον and τι θαυμαστόν. So far as the dialogue goes, different interpretations could be imagined. It looks as if this question of synthetic predication were just what Plato did

not wish to raise except by way of hints and anticipations. This is natural enough if the main answer attributed to Socrates consists in urging that there are many distinct forms. There is, however, no doubt, I think, that by such phrases as τὰ πολλὰ ὁμοία the *Parmenides* means things which are like—e.g., sticks and stones, etc. I am dealing with this point in section C.

asserted their reality against the strict form of Zeno's thesis. Historically, the broad contrast between Platonism and Eleaticism may best be expressed, as it often is, by comparing their respective attitudes to *γινόμενα*; but Plato is not bound to select that contrast for dramatization when the protagonists meet, and could scarcely have thought that Socrates' speech here helps to define his attitude to them. Parmenides too, if that had been the question at issue, could easily have done better in his reply. His discussion of participation appears in fact to be directed against the hypothesis of *εἶδη* from which such difficulties flow; but he might have reversed its direction. When he is offered *εἰκασθῆναι* (132D) to define the relation between particulars and forms he might well have asked, if his interest had lain there, how much reality such a definition leaves to particulars. He could scarcely have wished for an easier opening. As Plato uses the metaphor of likeness (e.g., in *Republic* VI) it expresses an inferior degree of reality, and participation in reals, thus conceived, would make by itself a far from satisfactory defence of particulars against Zeno.

But there is more than one reason for finding it hard to accept the view, so commonly held, that Socrates is 'vindicating the reality of sticks and stones' by way of a defence of pluralism acceptable to commonsense. No doubt to say that particulars participate in forms and forms are real provides some defence for them, whatever the mode of participation; they must have some share in reality. But in fact Socrates showed himself quite unwilling to admit forms of 'sticks and stones', and very guarded even concerning the elements of matter, such as fire and water; and if we take our examples from the instances of such forms as he did allow, the situation becomes rather complex; to suppose that he refers to *them* as a vindication of pluralism would, as it happens, bring his position here into conflict with *Republic* V as well as VI, for Book V does seem to deny the unequivocal realization in the material order of instances of *ὁμοιότης*, *μέγεθος*, *κάλλος* and *δικαιοσύνη* (the forms enumerated in *Parmenides* 131A); and unless we hold that Plato had already abandoned the conclusions of that book along with the vicious theory of predication on which they are supposed (by some) to rest, the reality of such instances would form a singularly unfortunate basis of argument. In fact it is the reality of concrete individuals which Zeno seems to have been attacking; and it is hard to see how Socrates' reference to the ideal theory, in view of the very limited types of *εἶδη* he was willing to recognize, could have formed a relevant defence; it surely cannot be thought that the reality of a stone depends on its furnishing an instance, not of stoniness, but of likeness or unlikeness. A more reasonable explanation of Parmenides' concentration on the internal difficulties of the ideal theory would seem to be that he had understood Socrates as defending pluralism, not by vindicating the reality of particulars, but by defending the plurality of forms.¹ His speech (129) consists in challenging Zeno to prove that the charges brought against particulars, whatever they are worth in themselves, apply to forms at all. Admitting that he has not himself thought the subject out he stands to it that though individuals may be 'like and unlike', likeness never merges into unlikeness; or, in other words, that Zeno has not proved his case with respect to forms, and there are several of them. To such an argument it was quite relevant for Parmenides to reply by attacking their existence, and then, in the *γυμνασία* which follows, to convince Socrates that pluralism is no easier to believe in than monism even when sensible things are not in question.

No doubt Plato is well able (as in *Sophist* 248) to defend himself against an abstract monism even without recourse to the ideal theory at all. There are, for example, *ψυχαί*, of which neither the existence nor the plurality can be argued away. And even in the *Parmenides* Socrates' refusal to acknowledge forms of mud and hair does not

¹ I take it that a similar use of the plurality of forms underlies the position of the *εἰδῶν φίλοι* in the *Sophist*. Cp. 249c, where these and the

Eleatics are distinguished as *οἱ ἐν ἡ καὶ τὰ πολλὰ εἶδη λέγοντες*.

seem to endanger their existence; ταῦτα μὲν γε ἄπερ ὁρῶμεν, ταῦτα καὶ εἶναι. But he could not have quoted such things against Zeno without a serious enquiry, while the plurality of forms and their genuine distinctness from each other meet Zeno's monism squarely in the middle. If the existence of forms presupposes that of particulars, or if, whether by participating in them or otherwise, particulars are real, Socrates' argument becomes all the stronger, but in asserting the existence of more than one form he has already completed his case.

C. "Αμα εἶναι καὶ μὴ εἶναι.

It remains to examine the view, held by some, that the arguments of *Republic* V (475-480) rest on misunderstandings about predication which the *Sophist* overcomes, and if they do not, to discover what their true meaning is. From this view it would follow that the *Sophist* (251) and the *Philebus* (14-15) repudiate the reasons given in the *Republic* for the distinction of opinion from knowledge as 'childish and uninformative'.¹ Now the *Sophist* overcomes these misunderstandings by two means: (i) It admits the 'combination of forms'; but not of any one form with its opposite, and that is the type of criticism by which the *Republic* degrades the objects of δόξα. (ii) The *Sophist* also points out that to negate B-ness of A is not a denial that A exists; but if the *Republic* were arguing that so far as an action is not just it becomes to that extent nothing, Justice also, since it is not Courage, would be predicated out of existence and the forms themselves reduced to the rank of ἅμα ὄντα καὶ μὴ ὄντα.

In Book VII, 523-525, a passage clearly to be correlated with this, Plato distinguishes between two sorts of experience, one (νοήσεως οὐ παρακλητικόν) in which there arise only such questions as that of identifying a finger as a finger, that is, of recognizing objects of perception in their non-relational being; and another (ἐπισκέψεως δέον) in which the failure of commonsense to determine its objects in respect of contrary qualities, when they admit of either, shows up its limitations. If the conclusions come to about this second class, in either book, rested on the fallacies exposed in the *Sophist*, so far from such experiences being the birth of philosophy, as Plato describes them, they would be actual hindrances to it (τοῖς λόγοις ἐμπόδια, *Phil.* 14D).

The general tone of rather contemptuous censure in the later passages certainly seems more applicable to the ingenuities of 'the followers of Antisthenes and other such uneducated persons'² than to anything which Plato himself could have taken seriously at any stage of his development. But he might merely have failed to detect in his own work fallacies which were clear to him in their general nature, and the question can only be settled by examining the passage itself.

It is unfortunate that the crucial phase of the argument (479) is put forward and accepted in the dialogue without more discussion. From 467 to 479 Socrates is supposed to be in dispute with an imaginary empiricist (whose part Glaucon takes) whether knowledge is gained by studying the forms of beauty and justice or by travelling κατὰ κόμας ἢ κατὰ πόλεις to increase our acquaintance with music and fine spectacles, and with just actions and other particular sources of 'culture'. To settle it, certain agreements are come to between Socrates and his opponent. They agree (i) that only what is real can be known³, (ii) that the object of ignorance is non-existence, (iii) that opinion, being itself between ignorance and knowledge, requires

¹ The same reproach would have to apply equally to *Theaetetus* 154-155.

² I quote Aristotle's remark (*Met.* 1043B 24) with reference to mental types rather than to individuals or schools.

³ Τὸ παντελὲς ὅν of 477A should not be identified with ideal being at this stage of the argument. It is supposed to be common ground that

knowledge is of the real, just as it is that non-existence goes with ignorance. Socrates has to prove (after the repetition of the preliminary agreements in 478D) that it is the favourite interests of the φιλοθεάμων, and not his own, which are rightly to be classified as intermediate. Originally, both sides claim to know the real.

an int
accept
knowl
καλὰ
the po
the ma
and ug

It
between
things
between
H
detail
in the
79 and
here is
half an
difficul
habitua
that he
will ap
exactly
false, v
appear
will be
in sma
act, so
act wil
it scar
any ac
other c
mere p
its bei
which
qualitie
just an
and ca
bring i
exempl
Justice
any for

¹ See
² Cp.
τερε.

³ It is
by Phae
Simmi
smallne
in man
F. M.
pp. 282
as on a
exempl
have it
concepts

an intermediate class of objects. Whether a serious opponent of Platonism would accept that frame of reference may be doubted, but Plato makes the rival claims to knowledge turn entirely on the question, which of the two types of object, κάλλος or καλὰ θεάματα, should be relegated to the intermediate class. The qualifications for the post have been laid down already (477A) as ἅμα εἶναι καὶ μὴ εἶναι, and Plato brings the many beautifuls under that formula on the ground that they are both beautiful and ugly.

It must be that step of the argument which appears to some 'a confusion between existential and predicative uses of εἶναι'; as if Plato were saying, particular things are and are not beautiful, therefore they are and are not, therefore they lie between being and not-being. But this absurdity is ascribed to him quite needlessly.

He is clearly counting too much on the familiarity of the doctrine to explain in detail why both predicates are applicable to the same subject, but there is material in the earlier dialogues which seems more or less relevant. Probably the *Phaedo* (70-79 and 102-103) supplies the best commentary. The group of εἶδη actually dealt with here is much the same as in the *Phaedo*; beauty, justice, holiness, and their contraries, half and double, light and heavy, big and small¹; but there is perhaps even more difficulty here in bringing them all under the same rule, whatever it is, and Plato habitually groups them together from more than one point of view. Some suppose that he refers to the imperfection of particular things and events, as that some flaw will appear in the performance of action (cp. 473A) or that no physical quantity is exactly twice another; but if so, to call the act just or the quantity double would be false, whereas both of the antithetical statements seem to be taken as true². It appears rather to be a matter of context and relation; what is half of one quantity will be double another; Simmias partakes in greatness with respect to Socrates and in smallness with respect to Phaedo. We have no very clear statement why a just act, so far as it attains justice, must also in another respect be unjust; that a similar act will not be just on another occasion (cp. I 331C) may possibly be relevant, though it scarcely seems analogous with the case of half and double. One might argue that any action so occupies the time in which it occurs that it precludes the fulfilment of other claims which it would have been just to fulfil if it had been possible; so its mere particularity as an event in time not only brings justice about but prevents its being done. Big, small, light and heavy, might seem to be terms of relation which require a different treatment³, but Plato tends to think of them as absolute qualities which can be predicated of their subjects in a manner not altogether unlike just and beautiful. Of pairs of opposing forms each is itself one (ἐν ἑκάτερον, 476A) and can be apprehended apart from its relations, but to actualize such forms is to bring instances of them into a relational nexus through the effects of which whatever exemplifies them cannot help at the same time exemplifying their opposites also. Justice itself, on the other hand, although in being determined as justice it excludes any forms not involved in itself, never stands in an ambiguous relation with the same

¹ See note at end of article.

² Cp. *Parmenides*, 129D, ἀληθὴ ἀποφαίνει ἀμφοτέρω.

³ It is not that Simmias' greatness is surpassed by Phaedo's, but that when compared with him Simmias loses greatness altogether and acquires smallness. Plato's treatment of relations differs in many respects from the modern view; see F. M. Cornford, *Plato's Theory of Knowledge*, pp. 282 ff. Light and heavy we would conceive as on a continuous scale of weight; all bodies exemplify weight and we cannot say that they have it and have not. But we must take such concepts with reference to Greek ways of think-

ing. Cp. W. D. Ross, *Aristotle's Physics*, Intro. pp. 26-28. Dr. Ross suggests that the *Timaeus* implies a relative distinction between heavy and light, or at least something more like a relative one than Aristotle's. But Plato could not have been so thinking of them here; he calls them ἐναντία (479B 7) and treats them as opposite qualities—i.e., as if so far as a body is light it does not partake of heaviness at all, so that if it also partakes of heaviness it must be in some different respect—rather than as different quantifications of the weight which all bodies have. (Contrast the treatment of ἀπειρα in *Philebus* 24-25.)

form. Its participation in goodness makes it good, but its exclusion, as an individual *εἶδος*, of some kinds of goodness is not a reason for calling it bad. Forms are free from such ambiguities because they are not brought into relation by anything but their own nature.

By treating abstraction of the objects of study from their relational nexus as a condition of knowledge Plato wants to prove that some things (the objects of mathematics and philosophy) can, while others (the objects of the *φιλοθεάμων*) cannot be known or be the subjects of true propositions. One kind of object he represents also as a degree of the other, that is, as being less completely what the other (*τὸ παντελῶς ὄν*) actually is. Whether this is legitimate or not, its freedom from the special fallacy exposed in the *Sophist* can readily be demonstrated. From the statement that acts which are just are also 'other than just', to use the language of the *Sophist*, we are to infer, surely not that in that respect in which the act is other than just it¹, but that its justice, ceases to exist (*ὑπεκχωρεῖ ἢ ἀπολύεται*, *Phaedo* 102); or, in general, that there are no pure cases of participation in such forms as justice, beauty, the half or the heavy. Their representation in the field of particulars is all ambiguous. The argument, then, though distinct from, is to be paralleled with, the more familiar inference from the imperfection of concrete things (*Phaedo* 74-75), which it reinforces. As there are no true instances of justice among acts because none are more than approximately just, so also, because none are purely or exclusively just (this is the predicative use of *εἶναι*) even so far as they conform to the standard of perfection, Plato infers on that ground also that there exist no examples of justice (the existential use) which really are examples of it purely and simply.

To say that such cases both exist and not, and on that ground to place them between being and not-being, is no doubt rather fanciful. It seems probable enough that Plato was writing with some more or less actual opponent in view², and that in arguing *ad hominem* he is straining metaphysical possibilities in order to meet a false metaphysic on its own ground; one, for example, which allows no reality to justice outside its instances, and so lays itself open to the reply that it has in effect no instances, for though it may be exemplified in one aspect of an action it is not in another, and therefore the action as a whole is not an instance of it. No doubt if an act is just even in one respect, in that respect a case of justice exists, even though in another it does not; but taking both statements together Plato is entitled to say that such forms have only an intermittent or relative existence in the field of experience; if he chooses to express that conclusion by saying that their actualizations 'lie between being and not-being', the only serious difficulty is the suggestion of a scale of being in which the form more completely realizes the particular. Even on that score Plato might reply that it is not a matter of existence as individual being graded below existence as 'essence', but of the same nature or character being partially or ambiguously exhibited in concrete things which exists and is fully and purely apprehended only in abstraction from them. It is the nature of the particular, not its real existence, which is more completely realized in the form, and the *φιλόδοξοι* and *πρακτικοί* are therefore wrong in thinking that they have before them cases of justice capable of showing its nature as it is in itself.

It seems improbable, therefore, that this difficult passage contains a *general* doctrine about the real existence of individuals. The first step in explaining it is to rule out any inference from the meaning of negative predicates on the ground that

¹ If what is half, in being also other than half, ceased to exist, how could it be also double? It can only be 'as half' that it ceases to exist; i.e., it is not half in that respect. It is therefore not that which is half and double that has ambiguous existence, but its halfness and doubleness.

Similarly, *τὸ αἰσχρὸν* and *τὸ ἄδικον* are not to be taken here as pure negatives. That which is not beautiful retains the quasi-positive character of being ugly.

² Cp. Adam's note on 476d.

denials
Plato
That t
trasted
least p
Those
that th
thing,
with π
ized as
discuss
etc., 74
Socrate
they m
αὐτὰ δ
it clear
greatne
τούτω,
therefo
and no
Phaedo
the act
yet just
called
or not,
not the
to the
believe
of cult
conduc
advanc
they w
other v
presup
pletes
rest on
does no
are cal
Stones
are sai
they a
whom
to be c
study
sent ei

¹ See
² Wh
πολλὰ κ
he also
generall
either s
to the p
of γιγνέ
fore be

denials as well as affirmations apply to εἶδη no less than to their instances, while Plato is plainly trying to formulate some characteristic difference between them. That this difference depends on the relatedness of particulars with each other as contrasted with the 'abstractness' of forms seems also certain enough; and it seems at least probable that Plato had no wish to extend the doctrine to all particulars as such. Those who think him guilty of the logical fallacy in question must begin by supposing that that to which he denies unqualified being is the individual subject, the act or the thing, of which justice or heaviness is predicated. But the passage begins and ends with πολλὰ καλὰ and δίκαια and the like¹; they are all cases of particulars characterized as instances of certain forms. The meaning of such phrases as τὰ πολλὰ καλὰ is discussed in *Phaedo* 103B. They may refer either to the πράγματα (sticks, stones, etc., 74B) of which these qualities are asserted—περὶ τῶν ἐχόντων τὰ ἐναντία ἐλέγομεν, Socrates says there (looking back at 70 ff.), ἐπονομάζοντες αὐτὰ τῇ ἐκείνων ἐπωνυμίᾳ—or they may refer, as surely here, to the instances of the qualities in the things—ἐκεῖνα αὐτὰ ὧν ἐνόντων ἔχει τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν τὰ ὀνομαζόμενα. Accordingly, in *Phaedo* 102 he makes it clear that Simmias himself is not affected by his simultaneous participations in greatness and smallness in different respects—οὐ γάρ που πεφυκέναι Σιμμίαν ὑπερέχειν τοῦτῃ, τῷ Σιμμίαν εἶναι, ἀλλὰ τῷ μεγέθει ὃ τυγχάνει ἔχειν. That which is and is not, therefore, is not Simmias himself, but his greatness, which fluctuates between being and not-being according as Simmias is brought into relation with Socrates or with Phaedo. So in the *Republic* the object by reference to which δόξα is defined is neither the act as an individual, quasi-substantial, event, subject of this or that predicate, nor yet justice as a universal quality, but their supposed combination *in concreto*, which is called by courtesy the 'just act'; but if it is undetermined whether an action is just or not, it is equally uncertain whether its justice is a fact, and therefore whether or not the supposed 'just action' exists. Nor would any other result be equally relevant to the actual purpose of this part of the *Republic*². The φιλοθεάμονες are not those who believe in the existence of sights merely as objects of vision, but who set up standards of culture antagonistic to philosophy by taking the beauty of sights and the justice of conduct as their realities and claiming that their wide acquaintance with such things advances their knowledge and qualifies them for political life, while beauty and justice they would not be unwilling to place somewhere between being and not-being; in other words, they are implicitly denying the value of science and philosophy, which presuppose χωριστὰ εἶδη. Ordinary concrete experience of weights and sizes completes their intellectual equipment, and their claim to knowledge is made by Plato to rest on the reality of their objects in each case. But the argument against them does not have to challenge the reality of the act itself, or the sticks and stones which are called big and heavy; it is only its justice or their heaviness which is disputed. Stones themselves would seem to be classifiable with the 'fingers' which in Book VII are said to be ἱκανῶς ἤδη ὑπὸ τῆς αἰσθήσεως κρινόμενα; whether they are real or not, they are not set up as standards by the defenders of non-philosophical culture with whom Book V is arguing. The passage appears to have only a limited purpose, and to be chiefly preparing for the discussion of the ideal education which consists in the study of just those mathematical and ethical concepts that experience fails to represent either perfectly or unambiguously.

¹ See note at end of article.

² When in *Republic* VI 507 Plato recalls the πολλὰ καλὰ and classifies them loosely as ὁρώμενα, he also expands the term to cover γιγνόμενα generally. Just as in the *Phaedo*, he uses it in either sense indifferently. The reference in 507A to the previous discussions by which the status of γιγνόμενα has been established cannot therefore be confined to Book V. These subjects

have been discussed ἄλλοτε ἤδη πολλάκις, and as so often in dealing with aspects of the ideal theory, Plato treats it as too familiar to need detailed explanation. A fresh start was made in 502D-E (ὥσπερ ἐξ ἀρχῆς) and the metaphysics of the Divided Line do not really depend solely on Book V, but on 'what has often been said elsewhere'.

Unfortunately, Plato's treatment of the general question of participation in the *Sophist* (the *κοινωνία εἰδῶν*) throws no great light on the status of individuals. This *κοινωνία* is still treated as one between *εἶδη*; while rest and motion exclude each other, volume can combine with either. But how else in the end can we state such combinations except by saying that volumes may move or remain at rest? The so-called *κοινωνία εἰδῶν*, therefore, really presupposes the reality of individuals, whether Plato intended this result or not. Although some statements in the *Sophist* (e.g. 248E) do assert the reality of such individuals as *ψυχαί*, there is no general review of their status in the dialogue, as there very relevantly might have been, and nothing which seems to bear directly enough on the objections brought against particulars in the earlier work either to revoke them or to reconcile them with the new forms of statement¹.

N. R. MURPHY.

HERTFORD COLLEGE, OXFORD.

¹ If the meaning sometimes given to the phrase (*Rep.* 479D) τὰ τῶν πολλῶν πολλὰ νόμῳ καλοῦ τε περί καὶ τῶν ἄλλων were accepted, the view I have taken of the passage would be harder to defend. But τὰ νόμῳ can scarcely mean 'opinions', or 'formulae' (Bosanquet, *Companion*, ad loc., followed by others). With 'formulae' Bosanquet couples 'rules' or 'standards', and he makes it clear that his own (rather questionable) interpretation of the passage rests largely on this meaning of νόμῳ. See especially his note on 479E, where τὰ πολλὰ καλά become, not 'many cases of beauty', but 'many rules about beauty': it would follow that τὰ πολλὰ καλά are not even approximate instances of αὐτὸ καλόν. But if it is the popular rules or opinions about beauty that lie between being and not-being, there is no reason stated in the passage for placing them there. Plato in fact appears to be saying that nothing higher than opinion is possible concerning τὰ πολλὰ καλά because they (i.e., the objects about which we form opinions or rules) have a character which puts them in an intermediate position, and it seems incredible that he should ascribe an ontological status to these opinions or formulae themselves by way of summing up (ἡγήκαμεν ἄρα, ὡς εἴκεν) a discussion concerning the status of their objects. Nor does it seem by any means a natural rendering of the Greek phrase. Stallbaum's 'multa illa quae a multis pulchra aut

alia existimantur' gives the right general sense, but also involves a dubious treatment of νόμῳ, and is hard to reconcile with the repetition of the phrase in 484D. Possibly we could translate it here by 'customary pursuits', or even 'standards' (which are not the same as 'formulae') so long as in the end the 'many popular standards concerning beauty' are taken to refer to the πολλὰ καλά themselves which people take as standards, or which they pursue. Whatever the exact rendering, the term can hardly be anything but some sort of periphrasis for the objects which have been under discussion and not for any rules which we may set up about them.

So the supposed difficulty in 'making Plato's δόξατά coincide with his αἰσθητά' would not affect this passage at all. He is grouping certain particulars together as exemplifications of a certain type of form, whether they are sensible or not. We can infer from 471C-E 7 that δόξα is the power of coming to conclusions when there is not a clear apprehension of the object about which we are judging (e.g., that it is beautiful or heavy). As a faculty, therefore, it is easily distinguishable from θῆσι καὶ ἀκοῇ, nor are they species of it. The relation between it and them is, that of the objects of sight and hearing nothing can be asserted which is less precarious than opinion, although Plato is not concerned with sights and sounds, as such, in this passage.

Th
argum
they a
source
in Dio
that pa
general
questio
mistake
only ha
historia
Diodor
aimed
many h
this pri
Th
demon
three p
followi
it is mo
And it
stages i
these su
refrain
to one
remain
source.
the orig
in three
near the
the erro
Onomar
point is
the diffe

¹ In re
by Mr. V
and by I
sections
criticisms

² Mom
macedone
bardo LX
graphy;
Volquard
Gesch. bei

THE SOURCES OF DIODORUS SICULUS XVI.¹

I.

THE MACEDONIAN, GREEK, AND PERSIAN NARRATIVE.

THE source-criticism² of Diodorus XVI has been dominated by the principle of argument from detail. Thus, if two details in Diodorus' text are found to conflict, they are assumed to derive from different sources and, if similar, from the same source; and, where a fragment of an ancient historian is found to resemble a passage in Diodorus, that historian is assumed to be the source employed by Diodorus in that passage; finally, when a sufficient mosaic of such details is pieced together, general divisions are drawn to embrace each separate detail. But this principle is of questionable value: for it implies the tacit assumption that Diodorus made no mistake in compressing or transcribing detail, added no colour himself, and could only have derived a given detail, described in a given manner, from the one ancient historian whose description of that detail is preserved. When one remembers that Diodorus is a careless and unintelligent compiler of a compendious narrative, who aimed like Ephorus at lending each book a unity, and that the fragments of the many historians whom Diodorus may have excerpted are very scanty, it is clear that this principle admits of a large margin of error.

The erroneous deductions, based upon argument from detail, are often demonstrable. For instance, Pack³ noted that the *ἐνόςβεια* of Philip is alluded to in three passages (38, 2; 60, 4; 64, 3) and assumed that in each passage Diodorus was following the same source; but since the same phrase is used in the Proem (1, 4), it is more probable that we have here a refrain added from the Proem by Diodorus. And it is noticeable that these three passages occur in contexts summarizing the stages in the growth of Philip's power, the central theme proclaimed in the Proem; these summaries (of which I note at least twelve⁴) form a monotonous and ridiculous refrain (often with a prophecy of Philip's later successes), which can only be ascribed to one source, Diodorus himself. Similarly, where details differ, the possibility remains that Diodorus has himself produced the difference by misrepresenting his source. For instance, this must be so at 38, 6, where Onomarchus is described as the originator of the Sacred War, though Philomelus has been given that distinction in three earlier passages (23, 32, and 61); for it is inconceivable that any author, writing near the events, could have made so gross an error. How Diodorus came to make the error, whether by a slip of the pen or by compressing a fuller account showing Onomarchus' share in the antecedents to the seizure of Delphi, is immaterial: the point is that the discrepancy does not argue a change of source. Another instance, the different deaths attributed at 35, 6 and 61, 2 to Onomarchus and his mercenaries,

¹ In revising these articles I have been helped by Mr. Westlake, who read the Sicilian section, and by Professor Adcock, who read the other sections; I acknowledge with gratitude their criticisms and suggestions.

² Momigliano, *Le fonti della Storia greca e macedone nel libro xvi di Diod.* in *Rend. Ist. Lombardo LXV* (1932) pp. 523-543 with full bibliography; the more important earlier works are Volquardsen, *Unters. ü. d. Quellen d. gr. u. sic. Gesch. bei Diod. XI-XVI* (1868) pp. 107-118, and

Pack, *Die Quellen d. Berichtes ü. d. Heiligen Krieg in Diod. XVI* in *Hermes XI* (1876) pp. 179-201. Hereafter referred to as M., V., and P. Of more general works cf. G. L. Barber, *The Historian Ephorus* (1935) with appendices and bibliography.

³ P. p. 185.

⁴ E.g. at 8, 3; 8, 7; 22, 3; 38, 2; 53, 3; 54, 1; 60, 4-5; 64, 3; 69, 8; 74, 2; 75, 1; and 95, 2. References are to book XVI throughout, unless another book-reference is given.

does not argue a change of source, as Pack maintains,¹ but inaccurate abbreviation of his source by Diodorus.²

As the basis of Momigliano's paper consists of deductions drawn from such discrepancy and errors, it is necessary to point out that his deductions are not valid. In 2, 2-3 Momigliano³ finds two errors of fact: as a hostage, Philip is delivered by the Illyrians to the Thebans, and is then represented as a fellow-pupil with Epameinondas; he therefore deduces that these errors betray an unreliable source, different from that used in 1 and 3. But are not these errors more likely to proceed from the compendious style of Diodorus, writing several centuries after the events? This, I think, becomes certain when we notice that Justin records that Philip was sent as hostage first to Illyria and then to Thebes, and that he lived in the house of Epameinondas (Justin vii, 5 in domo Epaminondae, summi et philosophi et imperatoris): it is most probable that Justin and Diodorus, both using the same source, have provided us with an interesting example of the fallibility of Diodorus' method.

A more vital point to Momigliano's thesis is contained in the deduction⁴ that two sources are reflected by 'un indizio sicuro', the discrepancy between [*Φιλόμηλος*] *ἡναγκάσθητο τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἀναθήμασιν ἐπιβάλλειν τὰς χεῖρας καὶ σὺλᾶν τὸ μαντεῖον* (30) and *τῶν προγεγεννημένων στρατηγῶν ὃ μὲν πρῶτος ἄρξας Φιλόμηλος ἀπέσχετο τῶν ἀναθημάτων* (56, 5). The discrepancy is clear: but in view of the context of the passages there is reason to suspect that it is to be ascribed to the carelessness of Diodorus rather than to any change of source. For in the narrative of the war Philomelus' innocence and guilt is given with careful discrimination: in three cases his integrity is stated (24, 5; 27, 4; 28, 2) and then his guilt under stress of necessity (30, 1); in the digression, which deals with the guilt of the Phocian commanders and must derive from the same source as the narrative, Diodorus gives a compendious summary of the attitude of Philomelus. And it is probable that his compression has resulted in the expression of a half-truth, namely that Philomelus was innocent of the wanton sacrilege practised by his successors. In fact Momigliano's conclusion seems arbitrary.

The comparison of fragments with such points of detail in Diodorus often doubles the possible margin of error. For instance, Momigliano⁵ applies the passage mentioning Philomelus' guilt (30, 1) to Demophilus fr. 96,⁶ which begins *Ὁνόμαρχος δὲ καὶ Φάυλλος καὶ Φάλαικος οὐ μόνον ἅπαντα τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξεκόμισαν κ.τ.λ.* and continues with the fate of the women involved in their sacrilege: he then deduces that Diodorus could not have been using Demophilus at the passage 30, 1. But the context of the detail in Demophilus does not warrant Momigliano's assumption that Demophilus considered Philomelus innocent: the only safe deduction is that Demophilus, in an appendix dealing with the Delphian treasures, did not include Philomelus among the most rapacious spoilers of the temple.⁷ On the other hand, Momigliano's deduction that the passage 56, 5 expressing his innocence derives from Demophilus fr. 96, which he interprets to argue *ex silentio* the innocence of Philomelus, rests upon a triple assumption, that Diodorus has made no error, that Demophilus asserts the innocence of Philomelus, and that no other historian could have asserted his innocence.

Lastly, where several fragments are available, the difficulty of using them may

¹ P. p. 198; moreover, it is possible that the words *ἐκρέμασε* and *ἐστανρώθη* both refer to the Greek form of crucifixion.

² Or again the placing of Torone in the Hellespont (53, 2) and the impression left at 21, 3 that the battle (Embata) took place at the Hellespont: the former can only be due to Diodorus, the latter may well be due to compendium (the fleet probably concentrated in the Hellespont and later fought off Chios).

³ M. pp. 531 f.

⁴ M. pp. 525 f.

⁵ M. p. 526.

⁶ Fragments are quoted throughout this paper from Jacoby *F.Gr.H.*

⁷ Nor, in point of fact, could he have been, seeing that he had only one year of power after his first spoliation, and there is no evidence that he coined gold and silver as his three successors did. Cf. Strabo ix, 3, 8.

be noted. In describing the wounding of Philip at Methone Diodorus (34, 5) employs the word *τοξεύματι*: Momigliano¹ states that the same word is used in the same context by Theopompus (115 F 52) and Duris (76 F 36)—to whom he should have added Marsyas (136 F 16); from this he deduces that the source of Diodorus is here 'certamente' Duris, having himself used Theopompus. My objections to his deduction are that Didymus (to *Dem.* xii 43 f.), to judge from the form in which he preserves these fragments, is not quoting any single one author verbatim, that Diodorus in an abbreviated citation cannot be supposed necessarily to quote his source verbatim, that the word *τόξευμα* is not an unnatural word for any Greek writer at all to use, and that Duris in fact considered Philip to have been struck by an *ἀκόντιον*.

Not only is such argument from detail hazardous; it leads to conclusions which are to my mind highly improbable. For Momigliano concludes that in the space of 23 chapters (for Greek and Macedonian affairs to ch. 59) Diodorus changed his source 12 times; this is less incredible than the conclusion of Laqueur for Sicilian affairs, that Diodorus changed his source 18 times within 4 chapters, but even so it is very difficult to see why Diodorus should have departed from his habitual laziness by changing his source even 12 times in 23 chapters.

The method I wish to adopt is different; by regarding the narrative from the general angles of fullness, accuracy, military and political detail, and conception of the central theme, I hope to find separable groups of narrative. For each group an author of the same general qualities will be identified as a hypothetical source; fragments of the author and discrepancies in Diodorus will then be applied to test the identification. In this way we shall be less likely to force deductions from those details, which as we have seen are in themselves difficult to interpret.

At first sight the unevenness of XVI is striking. The career of Philip from 359 to 356 B.C. is treated fully, from 356 to 337 B.C. meagrely, and for the last year of his life fully but floridly; the Sacred War from 356 to 352 B.C. receives 26 chapters, the Social War 357-355 B.C. less than 2 chapters; the failure of Philip to pass Thermopylae occupies a genitive absolute, the siege of Perinthus 3 chapters; the same siege is narrated with clarity, the battle of Chaeronea with confusion. By starting from such general traits as these the following groups can be differentiated and labelled thus:

SOURCE I.

1-4, 8, and 14, 1-2, which form a consecutive narrative of the early career of Philip. The inter-relation of this group lies in the central position occupied by Philip, the eulogistic attitude towards him (e.g. 1, 6; 3, 1-3; 4, 6; 8, 1; 14, 2), and the attention to military and diplomatic detail (military numbers 2, 5; 2, 6; 4, 3; 4, 5; 4, 7; the Macedonian phalanx 3, 2: the tactics against Bardylis 4, 5: the siege of Amphipolis 8, 2; the diplomacy of Athens and Philip in 3, of Bardylis in 4, of Athens and Philip in 8, of Philip in Thessaly in 14, 2). Geographical explanation is given (1, 5; 2, 6; 8, 1; 8, 3; 8, 4: mines at Crenides 8, 6), and the whole group is marked by a clear grasp of general principles, accurate detail, and precise information. The peculiar feature of the Proem is the promise of a full account of Philip's career, figuring the conquest of the hinterland, the liberation of Delphi, the hegemony over a willing Greece, the liberation of Ionia, the clash with Persia, and the legacy to Alexander. This Proem proceeds from a source which saw in the career of Philip not the humiliation of Greece but a Panhellenic crusade against Persia under the guidance of Philip; the same mentality appears in 14, 2, where the loyalty of Thessaly to Alexander is foreshadowed; but this attitude to Philip and this promise

¹ M. p. 530.

of a full account are only realised in this group and in one other group, which we shall now consider.

74-76, 4, the siege of Perinthus, treats Philip as the central figure (e.g. 74, 1-2; 75, 1), gives a military number (74, 6), full account of the siege warfare, and geographical detail (76, 1): the diplomatic situation is fully given, and the salient point of the narrative is the clash between the Persian empire and the power of Philip (75, 1). The narrative ends abruptly at the division of Philip's forces, before the declaration of war by Athens.

Lastly, we may notice that this source¹ only covers the years from 360/59 till 357/6, and reappears for the year 341/0: and, since Diodorus has not only retained a Proem promising a full account of Philip but has himself added a refrain throughout his work to keep Philip in the foreground, we may conclude that the source was only available for Greco-Macedonian affairs at those two points: a first-class source, writing at full length with the power of Philip as a central theme.

SOURCE 2.

23-31, 5; 32-33; 35-36, 2; 37-39; 56-63, being a narrative of the Sacred War. The first group (23-31) is regarded by source-critics as containing a narrative doublet, derived from two separate sources; I have argued elsewhere² that on chronological grounds a narrative doublet is impossible. And on internal grounds there is no reason to suspect a change of source: thus of the upholders of the doublet theory Beloch believes Diodorus to have excerpted the same source twice³ and Cloché admits that 'le ton et les tendances' reveal a consistent attitude.⁴

The outstanding characteristic of the passages ascribed to Source 2 is that the central theme throughout is the fate of the Phocian commanders: Philip, Athens and Thessaly only figure in so far as they are directly concerned in the events of the Sacred War. Thus we find seven chapters dedicated to the antecedents of the general campaign in 354 B.C., climaxes in the narrative marked by the end of Philomelus (31, 4), of Onomarchus (35, 6), of Phayllus (38, 5), and capitulation of Phalaecus (59, 3); an appendix (61-63) follows which is concerned with the fate of the Phocian leaders and of their mercenaries. Because these form the central theme, Philip only appears to defeat Onomarchus (35), to be frustrated at Thermopylae (38, 1), to help Thebes (58, 3), and to end the war (59-60); similarly, Athens only figures as an ally of Phocis and occasional participant: her action at Thermopylae occurs in a genitive absolute and she is never mentioned in the last year of the war. This change of central theme marks the essential difference between Source 1 and Source 2.

The interrelation of the groups ascribed to Source 2 is clear. Throughout we find knowledge and citation of Amphictyonic procedure (23, 2-4; 24, 4-5; 25, 2: the digression on oracular procedure 26; 28, 4; 29; 31, 1; 57, 4; 59, 4 and 60), interest in omens (27, 2; 33; 56, 8; 58, 5), and antiquarian lore (23, 5 quoting Homer; 26; 56, 6 quoting Homer). To this we may add a remarkable wealth of military numbers, especially on the Phocian side (in 24, 25, 30, 35, 37, 38, 39, 58, 59, 63), no conception of military strategy (e.g. the battle of the Crocus Field in 35, 5), and no geographical commentary. And throughout there are traces of a particular mentality, in which piety and impartial judgement are blended: as we have seen above, the motives of

¹ We have already dealt with M.'s reasons for ascribing 2-4 to a different source from that used at 1: on p. 541 he regards the account of the siege of Perinthus as deriving from a third and different source. The inaccuracy at 1, 4 is rightly explained by M. as providing no indication of source (p. 531); the same conclusion is made with regard to 2, 6 pp. 532-534; V. p. 116 considers τὴν Μακεδονικὴν φάλαγγα at 3, 2 and

Φάλαγγον at 8, 7 derived necessarily from a late author, wrongly in the former case, cf. *Dem. Phil.* iii. 49, and unconvincingly in the latter by the argumentum ex silentio.

² *J.H.S.* LVII (1937) Part I.

³ Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.* III 2 p. 28.

⁴ Cloché, *Étude chronol. sur la trois. guerre sacrée*, pp. 4-5.

Philom
mercen

27, 2:

Archid

τὴν πρὸ

βεβαίως

Βοιωτῶν

(58, 3).

on the

tendenc

Sou

of whic

the tone

geograp

no need

SOURCE

Thi

21-22, 2

the batt

rhetoric

troops a

confeder

intereste

Charles 2

Nex

without

(placed i

that Ath

their aut

prelude

headed b

thenes, a

ruption v

source,³ i

to Philip

are disto

In 6.

accurate

the hand

necklaces

The femi

is steeped

it has affi

77, 2

Athens fr

of Athens

¹ It has

referring to

60, 4—two

added by D

the Proem.

² The m

not his sour

Philomelus are carefully analysed, and the same is true of Onomarchus (32, 3), of the mercenaries employed after the spoliation (30, 2), of the Phocian people (24, 1; 27, 2; 32, 2), of the Athenians (57, 1 f.), of Sparta (24, 2; 29, 3; 57, 1), and of Archidamus (63, 1); most striking are the analyses of the motives of Thebes *διὰ τὴν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσεβείαν καὶ διὰ τὸ συμφέρειν αὐτοῖς τὰς τῶν Ἀμφικτυόνων κρίσεις βεβαίαις εἶναι* (28, 4) and of Philip¹ *βουλόμενος τὰ Λευκτρικὰ φρονήματα συνστῆλαι τῶν Βοιωτῶν . . . αὐτὸ μόνον φυλαττόμενος τὸ δοκεῖν μὴ περιορᾶν τὸ μαντεῖον σεσυλημένον* (58, 3). Lastly, one may add a fondness for digression—on oracular procedure (26), on the temple treasures (56, 6 f.), and on the fate of the sacrilegious (61-63); and a tendency to mention the opinion of other sources (56, 7 and 63, 4).

Source 2, therefore, appears to be a monograph describing the Sacred War of which the central theme is the history of the Phocian commanders and of which the tone is a blend of piety and impartiality; it is detailed, ignorant of military and geographical principles, fond of digression, and given to antiquarian lore. There is no need to enlarge on the difference between this source and Source 1.

SOURCE 3.

This source begins with the narrative of the Social War in two parts (7, 3 f. and 21-22, 2), a thin and inaccurate account (e.g. Chabrias is mentioned as strategos and the battle of Embata is apparently placed in the Hellespont²). The account is rhetorically coloured, Chabrias dying a 'noble' death, Artabazus having 'a few' troops against the Persian '70,000', Athens 'easily' making a settlement with her confederates: in so far as sympathy is discernible, the source is pro-Athenian and interested in personalities (Chabrias 7, 4; Iphicrates and Timotheus 21, 1 and 21, 4; Chares 22, 1).

Next follows the narrative of the Olynthian war (53-55). The war is described without mention either of Athens or of Euboea: and the collapse of Chalcidice (placed in the Hellespont³) is ascribed to bribery. There follows in 54 the statement that Athens always helped the victims of Philip and urged the Greek states to defend their autonomy, the chief statesman at this time being Demosthenes—a strange prelude to the Peace of Philocrates and an incorrect inference from the embassy headed by Aeschines in 348 B.C. Further ingredients are quotations from Demosthenes, anecdotes about Philip, the story of Satyrus, and comments upon the corruption which led to the betrayal of autonomy. Here again we have a pro-Athenian source,⁴ interested in personalities, anecdotes, and a rhetorical champion of autonomy; to Philip as a personality, however, there is no enmity, but his methods of conquest are distorted for the worse.

In 64 occurs an appendix to the major appendix (61-63): it opens with an inaccurate remark that Athens and Sparta lost their hegemony and their freedom at the hands of Antipater, and proceeds to tell the story of the women who took the necklaces of Helen and Eriphyle, and closes with one of Diodorus' refrain passages. The feminine interest (64, 2) reminds one of the story about Satyrus, and the narrative is steeped in rhetorical colour. While it differs in tone from Source 2⁴ and Source 1, it has affinities with Source 3.

77, 2-3 and 84-88, 2 contain a narrative covering the war between Philip and Athens from 340/39 to Chaeronea. In tone it is strongly pro-Athenian, the importance of Athens is stressed (77, 3; 84 f.; 87, 3), a fictitious peace is introduced at 77, 3

¹ It has been shown above that the passages referring to the *εὐσεβεία* of Philip at 38, 2 and 60, 4—two of the 12 refrain passages—were added by Diodorus to maintain the tone set in the Proem.

² The mistake may be due to Diodorus and not his source.

³ M. p. 538, however, regards this narrative as written with 'assoluta freddezza', deducing therefrom a source 'non filo-ateniese'.

⁴ To whom we have ascribed the appendix 61-63; it is a priori unlikely that the source responsible for the major appendix would also append a second appendix.

and 84, 2 to explain that Philip's treachery placed Athens at a disadvantage, and special attention is given to the Athenian losses. Again we have quotations from the orators, glorification of Demosthenes, the anecdotes of Demades and Lycurgus: the military narrative is worthless and highly coloured with rhetorical flourishes.

The history of Philip closes with 91-94, a rhetorical account of the court-scenes at Pella and of the assassination of Philip.

Source 3 is clearly pro-Athenian, nurtured on the Attic orators, interested in anecdotes, court-scenes and gossip, a champion of the autonomous tradition, attentive to personalities. One would imagine a third-rate Hellenistic historian, bred in Athens: his method is to mingle a thin factual account with a deal of scandal.

In endeavouring to identify our sources, we begin with the general knowledge that Diodorus has used Ephorus consecutively for books XI-XV, chooses canonized authors, who appear in the citations from a chronographic source, and prefers to follow one author rather than jump from author to author and back again. The choice then is limited to those mentioned in book XVI—Theopompus (3, 8; 71, 3), Ephorus (14, 3; 76, 5), Demophilus (14, 3), and Diyllus of Athens (14, 3; 76, 5)¹—and to Duris of Samos mentioned in book XV (60, 6); of these Theopompus can be excluded for Greco-Macedonian affairs, because his work in fifty-eight books presented too heavy a task to a compiler such as Diodorus and because the numerous fragments we possess find no echo in Diodorus.² Four are left as conjectural sources: let us see if and how they fit.

Identification of Source 2.

The most obvious and I think the only candidate for Source 2, a monograph on the Sacred War with the Phocian commanders as central theme, is Demophilus: for the other known monographers, Cephisodorus and Leon, are not mentioned in Diodorus and the complete lack of fragments suggests that they were not used by later authors.

The scope of Demophilus' work is supplied by the chronographic source³ in Diodorus, which Jacoby⁴ holds to be 'very reliable': resuming the narrative of Ephorus, which had broken off at the year 357/6, Demophilus wrote only⁵ a history of the Sacred War, lasting eleven years from the seizure of Delphi to the fall of the sacrilegious Phocians (14, 3). The duration of the war is elsewhere⁶ given as ten years, which is to be reckoned from 355/4 to 346/5, the declaration and conclusion of the Sacred War proper by the Amphictyons: but the war according to Demophilus lasted eleven years from the seizure of Delphi in 357/6 to 347/6, i.e. from the action of Philomelus (23, 1) to the capitulation of Phalaecus (59, 3-4).⁷ Demophilus'

¹ Callisthenes of Olynthus is also mentioned (14, 3) as ending his history in 357/6: he fits no one of our sources and nobody to my knowledge has advanced him as a possible source for the early part of book XVI.

² This is generally agreed: cf. Cavaignac, *Mélanges Glotz* I, p. 152.

³ Perhaps Apollodorus of Athens; it is known that the chronographic source used by D. gave the dates both of events and of the beginning and end of canonized historical works. For convenience, I call the source 'chronographic', although 'chrono-biblio-graphic' would meet the facts more precisely.

⁴ Jacoby II c p. 28.

⁵ The evidence supplied in D. 14, 3-5 and 76, 5-6, which defines the limits of Ephorus Demophilus and Diyllus, makes this certain; cf. Jacoby II c pp. 28 f. Cavaignac, *op. cit.* pp. 154 f., Walker, *Hellen. Oxyr.* pp. 87 f., and Schwartz, *Hermes* XLIV 482 f. are arbitrary in rejecting

evidence derived from the chronographic source.

⁶ Aeschines ii 131, iii 148, Callisthenes fr. 1, Duris fr. 1, Pausanias ix 6, 1, x 2, 2, x, 3, 1, x 8, 2. Diodorus gives the duration of the war from Demophilus at 14, 3 as eleven years sub 357/6 and consistently again as nine years at 23, 1 sub 355/4; but at 59, 1 as ten years sub 346/5: the explanation surely is that Diodorus took the duration and the narrative from Demophilus, but in quoting from his date-table gave the orthodox duration of the war as calculated at ten years. The same combination of the tradition of Demophilus and of the orthodox chronology is responsible for the error of Pausanias, who follows Demophilus in starting the war from the seizure of Delphi sub 357/6 but then applies the orthodox duration of ten years to foreclose his war at 348/7 (Paus. x 2, 2).

⁷ Dated by Demosthenes xix 59 to the last month of 347/6.

history, then, had as its central theme the Phocian commanders: he thus fits the general postulates made for Source 2.

The fragments provide further evidence: they are citations from the thirtieth book of Ephorus (J. 70). Fr. 93 reveals interest in Homer and antiquarianism: fr. 94 and fr. 95 provide small details of the war in Boeotia and in Thessaly: fr. 96 begins with the statement, which we have treated above, that Onomarchus, Phayllus, and Phalaecus plundered the whole of the Delphian treasure. In this list of wholesale spoilers, Philomelus does not appear, a point which is in keeping with Source 2's description of Philomelus' use of the treasures. The fragment continues with the fate of the women who took the necklaces of Helen and Eriphyle: but as the fate of the women is different from that given in Diodorus 64, a passage ascribed to Source 3, there can be no question of 64 deriving from Demophilus. The fragment throws further light on Demophilus: his version of the story is told in a prosaic, not a gossiping, vein and is introduced for its antiquarian interest (cf. the Echecrates story in 26, ascribed to Source 2 above), and gives rise to the quotation of two oracles in verse.

Demophilus fits Source 2 precisely. We may notice in passing that the story of the necklaces as it appears in Diodorus dates ultimately from Demophilus but has been given a twist both in fact and in colour by an intermediate source between Demophilus and Diodorus.

Identification of Source 1.

For Source 1 Ephorus must advance first claim, since he was followed by Diodorus for the books XI-XV. Source 1 has two peculiarities—his general qualities and his quantity, i.e. he is available only till 357/6 and again in 341/0. In respect of general qualities there is no doubt that Ephorus is strikingly similar to Source 1: the eulogistic tone, the nature of the Proem,¹ the Pan-Hellenic colouring, the attention to geography, the colour in military narrative, and especially the firm grasp of a central theme are typical of Ephorus.² In respect of quantity, however, we shall have a more definite criterion, if we can determine the limits of Ephorus' work.

The chronographic source of Diodorus, which Jacoby regards as trustworthy, provides the data: 14, 3 Demophilus composed the history of the Sacred War *παραλειφθέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς, ὀνομασθέντα δὲ ἱερὸν* from 357/6, and 76, 5 *Ἐφόρος ἐνθάδε κατέτροφεν εἰς τὴν Περὶνθου πολιορκίαν (ἐνθάδε being explained by the end of Diodorus' account of the siege in 76, 4).* These data raise the problem: by what avenue did Ephorus, when he had stopped at 357/6 for Greek affairs, reach the siege of Perinthus? The answer is vital to our inquiry, for, if Ephorus wrote a history of Philip or of Greek affairs to 341/0 excluding the Sacred War, then our Source 1 cannot be identified with Ephorus.

The problem can only be solved by reference to the method of Ephorus' composition: Diodorus V 1, 4 supplies the evidence *τὰς κοινὰς πράξεις ἀναγράφων . . . κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν . . . τῶν βιβλίων ἐκάστην πεποίηκε περιέχειν κατὰ γένος τὰς πράξεις*, i.e. each book contained a central theme, foreshadowed in a Proem.³ What constituted a central theme is shown by the fragmentary books prior to 360 B.C.: to quote Jacoby, book XX contained the peace of Antalcidas and the Spartan Hegemony, book XVI the first half of Dionysius I's tyranny, book XXVIII the second half, and books XXIII-XXV were the 'Epameinondasbücher'. The moral is drawn by Jacoby:⁴

¹ Cf. Laqueur, *Ephorus in Hermes* XLVI pp. 161 f.

² Cf. G. L. Barber, *The historian Ephorus*; the remarks p. 143 on colour in his military narrative, e.g. for the battles of Leuctra and Mantinea, are appropriate to the battle of Philip and Bardylis and to the siege of Perinthus; the stock phrases *κατὰ μάχην, ἐρρωμένως, ἰσθρόπως*, and *ἀνδραγαθίας* appear in 4, 6 and *ἐδρώστω, νύκτωρ*,

ἀνδραγαθίας recur in 74, 3 and 6 and in 75, 3. Barber, however, goes too far when he attributes this colour entirely to Ephorus; for the same colouring and exact phrases recur in the narrative of Chaeroneia (86, 2 f.) and Crimisus (79, 5 f.), where Ephorus was certainly not the source.

³ Cf. Laqueur *ibid.*

⁴ J. II c p. 26.

'wir dürfen ohne weiteres sagen, dass die Darstellung *κατὰ γένος* in der Hauptsache eine solche nach den drei oder (von 360 an) vier grossen Schauplätzen—Hellas Orient Westen Makedonien—bedeutet'. But Jacoby gives too geographical a definition of *κοινὴ πράξις* . . . *κατὰ γένος*:¹ a central theme such as the Spartan Hegemony is the primary quality of a *κοινὴ πράξις*, whereas a geographical field, within which the *κοινὴ πράξις* is enacted, may or may not be a concomitant.

The last of the 'Epameinondasbücher' must have ended at the death of Epameinondas in 362 B.C.: what was the central theme of the next book? Clearly the five years to 357/6 provide no central theme; therefore the book, which broke off at that date, was incomplete. Two themes suggest themselves as titles, either the breakdown of the great Greek powers, Athens and Thebes, or the rise of Philip; but these two themes are in execution inextricably mingled, the breakdown of the Greek powers and the rise of Philip both turning upon the Social and Sacred Wars: a treatment in separate books would involve endless reduplication.² We conclude then that the unfinished book reaching to 357/6 treated of Greco-Macedonian affairs, with either of the suggested topics as central theme. Ephorus, in fact, reached the siege of Perinthus neither via Greek nor via Macedonian affairs.

Ephorus presumably composed one theme, or one book, at a time; if, then, the book ending at 356 B.C. was incomplete, it follows that the book ending at 341/0 was complete. And the climax of this book, the siege of Perinthus, has an obvious significance: it marks the first crossing of Persian troops into Europe since the Persian wars, a matter of significance to a Panhellenist. And it forms a clear point of junction with the rise of Macedon, later to destroy the Persian empire, and with the Greco-Macedonian affairs, which had been marked by a *κοινὴ εἰρήνη* and by an alliance between Athens and Philip, only broken during the division of forces between Perinthus and Byzantium.³ These three aspects of the siege of Perinthus show that it might mark the end of a book dealing either with Persian or with Greco-Macedonian affairs: as we have already seen that the latter stopped short at 357/6, it is clear that Ephorus left a complete book on Persian affairs culminating in the siege of Perinthus, the first clash between Persia and Europe; of this Persian book the central theme may have been the consolidation of Persia under Artaxerxes Ochus, who by 342/1 had reduced Egypt and Ionia.

This interpretation is supported by further evidence⁴ in Diodorus: (14, 3) Diyllus of Athens beginning from the *ἱεροσύλησις* under 357/6 included in his first 'Syntaxis' Greek and Sicilian affairs down to 341/0, and (76, 6) Diyllus beginning his second 'Syntaxis' from the end of Ephorus' work under 341/0 included Greek and Persian affairs (*τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ τῶν βαρβάρων*) to the death of Philip son of Cassander (296 B.C. probably). The limits of the first 'Syntaxis' (357/6-341/0) reveal the fact that Diyllus wrote a supplement to fill the gaps in Ephorus' unfinished history; upon comparing the contents of Syntaxis I with those of Syntaxis II, one concludes that Ephorus had completed the narrative of Persian affairs to 341/0. A second conclusion is that the narrative of Greek and of Sicilian affairs was not written by Ephorus

¹ The view of Walker, *Hellenica Oxyr.* pp. 95 f., that Ephorus' system is a chronological division by generations, seems to me untenable.

² Jacoby II c pp. 29 f. believes that the history of Philip was written as 'the consolidation of Philip's power in the north' to 342/1, whereas Greek affairs were to be separately treated but only reached 357/6. How the rise of Philip can be treated without reference to the Social War, covering his expansion in the north, the Sacred War, admitting him into Thessaly and the Delphian Amphictyony, and the Athenian negotiations over Cersobleptes, I cannot under-

stand.

³ The predominance of Demosthenes in our literary tradition is apt to obscure the Panhellenic possibilities of the alliance which led to a specific agreement of common policy against Persia in 344/3 (cf. Philip's letter, Dem. xii 6), and was intact (Dem. xii 22) until the episode in the middle of the siege of Perinthus. Theopompus (115 F 217) marks the outbreak of war between Philip and Athens at the same point, the siege of Perinthus and Byzantium.

⁴ This evidence, so far as I know, has not been hitherto applied to this problem.

for 357/6
Sacred

La
The iv
with th
limited
ments
method
is the l
Κασσάν
book X
Thus b
affairs
are men
in date
affairs,

Th
a finish
Thus n
with th

In
siege o
Diodor
book X
Ephoru

Th
Persian
Volqua
marked
fleet is

47, 7),
warfare
special

44, 1 f.
(e.g. N
commo
of Peri
341/0 v
Perinth

An
of conse
the rev
Chares
excites
Thessa
passage

¹ How
this frag
Agésilau
be conce
thesis th
Macedon
book left,
But, his

for 357/6-341/0; and a third, that Demophilus (= Ephorus XXX) only wrote of the Sacred War.

Lastly, the fragments of Ephorus must be employed to check our reconstruction. The five fragments of book XXX, quoted both as Demophilus and as Ephorus, deal with the Sacred War: this book then represents the monograph of Demophilus, limited to the Sacred War and included in the history of Ephorus. The four fragments of books XXVIII and XXIX deal with Sicily, which, in view of Ephorus' method, means that both were concerned exclusively with Sicilian affairs. Book XXV is the last of the 'Epameinondasbücher': book XXVI is represented by one fragment, *Κασσάνωρος· πόλις Ἀιγυπτία*, which relegates that book to Persian affairs¹; and book XXVII has two fragments, *Βύμαζος· πόλις Παιόνων* and *Ζηράνιοι· ἔθνος Θράκης*. Thus book XXVII must be the unfinished book, dealing with the Greco-Macedonian affairs till 357/6; and, as Philip was at war with Paeonia in 358 B.C. and the Zeranii are mentioned in a fragment of Theopompus book III, both fragments may be anterior in date to 357/6. Of the unnumbered fragments relating to Greco-Macedonian affairs, the latest in date mentions the birth of Alexander in summer 356 B.C.

The limits of Ephorus' work are now defined: Greek and Macedonian affairs in a finished state only until 357/6 and Persian affairs to the siege of Perinthus in 341/0. Thus not only the general qualities but also the precise limits of Source 1 coincide with those of Ephorus; we conclude, therefore, that Ephorus is Source 1.

In our analysis of book XVI, only Greco-Macedonian affairs were treated, the siege of Perinthus being included as bearing a Greco-Macedonian character in Diodorus' arrangement. But Diodorus must have found the account in Ephorus book XXVI and set it apart in his own chronological setting; the remainder of Ephorus XXVI may also be used in the Persian narrative of Diodorus XVI.

The Persian narrative (40, 3-52, 8) is drawn from a consecutive source; the similar Persian narratives in the books X-XV are known to derive from Ephorus, and Volquardsen² had no hesitation in ascribing this narrative also to Ephorus. It is marked by the same citation of numbers (e.g. 40, 6: the 300 triremes of the Persian fleet is the figure normal in Ephorus), geographical detail (41, 1-2; 42, 3; 46, 5-6; 47, 7), grasp of military strategy (e.g. the triple attack on Egypt), interest in siege-warfare (e.g. preparations for defence of Sidon, and operations in Egypt), and by special attention to the relations of Greece and Philip with Persia (42, 2 and 7; 44, 1 f.; 46 and 47; 48, 2; 52, 3 Philip), and study of Greek satraps and generals (e.g. Nicostratus, Mentor, Evagoras, Hermeias³). These features are not only common to the passages ascribed to Ephorus' history of Philip but also to the siege of Perinthus: and the Persian narrative ends in the year 342/1, to be resumed for 341/0 with the clash between Philip and Persia (75, 1), ending in the siege of Perinthus. Ephorus XXVI, then, is the source used in Diodorus XVI 40, 3-52, 8.

An isolated passage (34, 1-2), which was omitted from our survey of the groups of consecutive narrative, may with reason be ascribed to Ephorus XXVI. It records the revolt of Artabazus from the Great King, which prompted the intervention of Chares and Pammenes, and the victory of Pammenes in Asia Minor; the victory excites praise of Boeotia for sending forces overseas, when she had been deserted by Thessaly and was involved in the Sacred War. The immediate reference of the passage is to Persian history, the praise of Boeotia is in accord with the pro-Theban

¹ However, Jacoby II c p. 59 considers that this fragment may refer to the activities of Agesilaus in Egypt and then that the book may be concerned with Greek affairs. Upon Jacoby's thesis that XXVII is to be ascribed to purely Macedonian affairs, it is necessary that the only book left, viz. XXVI, be available for Greek affairs. But his view is most unlikely: since the ac-

tivities of mercenary commanders in Egypt and the East are always contained in the Persian narratives of Diod. XI-XV deriving from Ephorus.

² V. p. 108: cf. e.g. Diod. XV 90-93.

³ Wormell, *Yale Classical Studies* V (1935) p. 92, ascribes the account of Hermeias' fall to Ephorus.

sympathies of Ephorus, and we have noted that the Persian narrative in Diodorus contains reference to States of Greece Proper; I conclude that this passage, like that describing the siege of Perinthus, is derived from Ephorus XXVI, but has been separated by Diodorus from his Persian narrative¹ and placed under the appropriate year (it is introduced by the stock connection *ἀμα δὲ τούτοις πραττομένοις*).

It remains to say a word in defence of our ascription of the *Proem* to Ephorus. In a general study of Diodorus' *Proems*² Fr. Kunz concludes that in books XI-XV Diodorus drew his *Proems* from Ephorus but in book XVI from another and unknown source; apart from her arbitrary assumption that Ephorus 'ist ja mit Buche XV sicher zu Ende', her conclusion is based upon a comparison of the method and content of the individual *Proems*. She finds that the *Proem* of XVI differs from those of XI-XV in that the former contains two novelties, firstly an interweaving of *Proem* proper and 'Inhaltsangabe', and secondly a laudatory tone. For this distinction I can see no basis: for instance, the *Proem* to book XV reveals a mentality capable of both laudation and censure (e.g. XV 1, 1 and 3), and the interweaving of *Proem* proper and 'Inhaltsangabe' is more marked in XV (1, 2) than in XVI. Nor, if a novelty were discernible, is Fr. Kunz justified in deducing a change of source: for in practice she ascribes the *Proems* of XII and XIII, which she classes in different groups, to the same source, and in theory her hypothesis is arbitrary. For why should Ephorus compose every *Proem* on an exactly similar pattern? Why should a eulogy of Philip be incompatible with a condemnation of Spartan imperialism?

The peculiarity of the *Proem* to XVI lies not in its relationship to the *Proems* of the preceding books but in its relationship to the contents of book XVI. For, whereas the *Proem* both promises (1, 1) and summarizes (1, 4 f.) an *αὐτοτελὴς πράξις*, namely the whole career of Philip, the narrative gives after the year 356 B.C. a spasmodic and meagre account of Philip's actions. This peculiarity proves conclusively that Diodorus did not write this *Proem* out of his own head³: for to suppose that he added this *Proem* after writing the narrative of book XVI is nonsensical, and to suppose that he wrote a *Proem*, foreshadowing the allocation of the Phocian votes on the Amphictyonic Council and the victories of Philip in Illyria, Thrace, Paeonia, and Scythia, before he wrote the narrative of book XVI, postulates in Diodorus a more detailed knowledge than is credible.⁴

The *Proem* contains three elements: (1) a commonplace on historiography (§§ 1-2), (2) a summary of Philip's achievement and career (§§ 3-5), and (3) a platitudinous encomium and a link-phrase to introduce the narrative (§ 6). From what source could element (2) have been derived? Only, I believe, from a *Proem* introducing a book which dealt with Philip as central theme and saw in his career a

¹ D., presumably for reasons of space, was pleased to omit from his book a narrative of the Satraps' Revolt and the first invasion of Egypt under Artaxerxes Ochus; 40, 3-4 shows that he had learnt of it in Ephorus, but the only incident he has recorded is the Pammenes incident.

² Margrit Kunz, *Zur Beurteilung d. Proemien in Diod. hist. Bibl.*, Zürich, 1935: on the *Proem* to XVI cf. pp. 54, 88 f., and 101 f.

³ The general question, whether D. had sufficient originality to compose any large-scale *Proem*, is answered by Kunz in the negative (p. 101) and by Laqueur (*op. cit.* p. 8) in the affirmative: I am here concerned solely with this particular case.

⁴ Indeed the Scythian campaign does not appear in the narrative of XVI. As Fr. Kunz

considers the *proems* to D. XVI and XVII to be derived from the same source, i.e. not from Ephorus, it is necessary to stress this fundamental difference between the two: in XVI we have a factual summary, in XVII a general summary. I believe there is nothing in the *Proem* to XVII which D. could not have written out of his own head: he appears to have expanded the commonplace with which he ended XVI, filled up his *Proem* with generalities about the heroism of Alexander, and then proceeded to his narrative. That he wrote this *Proem* before composing the narrative is clear from the declaration that he will include other contemporary events, which in fact are not so included.

vital
Epho
follow
at the
Thuc
the c
histor
have
detail

able.
applic
such
XXV
origin
inspir
at on
Philip
so so
concl
comp
direct

encon
palpa

Ident

Mom
istic
Helle
of th
given
Phyl
ascrib
not li

appro
Athe
Duri
Sour

of At

¹ It
necess
Philip
assum
introd
narrat
adopt
büche
whole
in bo
books

vital stage in the growth of Panhellenism; in other words, from the Proem of Ephorus XXVII,¹ which we have already seen was drawn upon by Diodorus in the following chapters. It may be objected that, because book XXVII was unfinished at the date of Ephorus' death, the Proem could not have been written: but does Thucydides V 26 support the hypothesis that a Proem is necessarily written after the conclusion of a whole work? Is it not credible that Ephorus, a contemporary historian with a background of research and of Isocratean Panhellenism, should have so far formed a preconception of Philip as to compose a Proem before the detailed narrative was completed?

When element (2) is ascribed to Ephorus, the presence of element (1) is explicable. Diodorus there defends the *κατὰ γένος* method, which he had not hitherto applied and in fact was to apply only for the opening chapters of book XVI; now, such a defence would clearly be out of place in a book so late in Ephorus' history as XXVII, therefore it must have been added by Diodorus himself (whether it is an original or a borrowed commonplace is immaterial). But what motive could have inspired Diodorus to insert a defence of a method which is in fact abandoned almost at once? The answer must be that he intended to follow for the whole career of Philip an author who wrote *κατὰ γένος*, i.e. Ephorus, and he abandoned the method so soon because Ephorus XXVII ended abruptly at 356 B.C. From this a general conclusion may be drawn: Diodorus did on occasion compose his Proem before he composed his book, introduce and close his Proem with original matter, and draw directly upon a Proem of Ephorus.

Element (3) marks another original contribution by Diodorus: the platitudinous encomium (cf. the tone of Diodorus' preface to book I) and the link-phrase are palpably of Diodorus' own forging.²

Identification of Source 3.

Most of the passages which we have ascribed to Source 3 are also ascribed by Momigliano to one source, which he identifies with Duris of Samos. The Hellenistic traits of this source support in general the claims of Duris but fit any other Hellenistic writer equally well: Momigliano has, however, observed that the story of the necklaces (64) appears in Phylarchus (81 F 70) in a form different from that given in Demophilus and more like that given in Diodorus; and he argues that as Phylarchus is known to have made use of Duris, the passage in Diodorus may be ascribed to Duris. But here again there can be no certainty: for Phylarchus was not limited to Duris and may have taken the story from elsewhere.

While there is no certainty that Duris of Samos is the source, there is something approaching certainty which excludes him. For the tone of the source is strongly pro-Athenian throughout the groups 54-55 and 84-88, and less strongly in 92-94³: but Duris is famed for 'seine antiathenische haltung'⁴ and therefore cannot be our Source 3.

An obvious candidate, who is twice mentioned in Diodorus book XVI, is Diyllus of Athens. The scope of his work, which we have noticed, fits the measurements

¹ It is, of course, not suggested that Ephorus necessarily intended to cover the whole of Philip's career in the compass of one book. I assume rather that Ephorus wrote a Proem to introduce an *αὐτοτελής πράξις*, of which the narrative might run into several books. If we adopt Jacoby's numbering, the 'Epameinondas-bücher' supply a parallel: the Proem to the whole career of Epameinondas came presumably in book XXIII, but the narrative comprised books XXIII-XXV.

² This Proem *en bloc* is ascribed by Laqueur to Ephorus, by Kunz, Schwartz, and Schoenle to a nameless source; M. (p. 531) hesitates between Diodorus and Ephorus but in a later publication ascribes it to Ephorus (*Filippo il Macedone* p. 195).
³ M. only admits this in the case of 84-88.

⁴ J. II c p. 116. M. p. 542 observes with reference to 84-88: 'È curioso inoltre osservare come l' antipatia per Atene di Duride si mitighi fino a scomparire per merito delle fonti retoriche da lui usate'; but this seems unconvincing.

of Source 3 precisely; for Source 3 occurs to supplement the Sacred War narrative for Greek affairs from 357/6 to 341/0, and then runs on unbroken to the assassination of Philip. In fact, it seems reasonable to suppose that Diodorus throughout book XVI was following (as he had done in books XI-XV) the universal history of Ephorus: as the work written by Ephorus' own hand began to fail, he proceeded with the continuation, represented by Demophilus' monograph and by Diyllus' supplement. With the end of Ephorus' work, he proceeded to use Diyllus' second 'Syntaxis' until the end of his own book.

Probable as this may seem, a check must be applied from the fragments of Diyllus. They are very few: (73 T 4) Diyllus wrote, in addition to his history, works such as criticism of drama and memoirs of generals and kings *ταῖς ἐκείνων ὑποδύμενοι μνήμας*; fr. F 1 pictures a State function in Macedonia; F 2 and F 4 tell of a *ἐταῖρα* and a *ἐταῖρος Δημοσθένους*, and F 3 of bribery. As the work of Diyllus covered the period from 357/6 till probably 296 B.C., he presumably lived until at least 275 B.C.

These characteristics reappear in Source 3, who quotes orators, mentions actors, admires Demosthenes, likes a racy story (e.g. 64), tells anecdotes of Philip and others, evaluates Athenian generals, and gives a highly coloured account of the Macedonian court (91-94). Since Diyllus was an Athenian citizen living in a period when Macedonia was detested, and derived his attitude to our period from the Attic orators, it is most probable that he was pro-Athenian in sympathy; nor, to judge from the colour of the fragments, was he a respecter of facts. The distortion of facts in favour of Athens which marks Source 3 is thus compatible with Diyllus of Athens.

So far, then, as the evidence can cover the identification, Source 3 may be identified with Diyllus.¹

THE RESIDUE² OF BOOK XVI.

In our analysis we have dealt with all the groups of consecutive narrative which seem to have an internal unity. There remains a series of isolated and brief passages, scattered throughout the book but similar in tone and in brevity: 7, 2, a short and inaccurate account of the stasis in Euboea (357/6); 22, 3, a note on the defeat by Philip of the coalition of inland tribes; 34, 3-5, notes of a battle in the Peloponnese, the capture of Sestos by Athens, the alliance of Athens and Cersobleptes, the siege of Methone and wounding of Philip (353/2); 52, 9, a note on Philip's conquest of Chalcidice and expulsion of Peitholaus from Pherae (349/8); 69, 7-8, a note of Philip's advance in Illyria and Thessaly (344/3); 71, 1-2, a note of Philip's campaign in Thrace (343/2); 89, a brief account of the formation and decision of the League of Corinth (337/6).

These passages certainly cannot be ascribed to any of our identified sources. At first sight one might conjecture that they represent notes left by Ephorus for the parts of his history which he never finished; but I doubt whether Ephorus would have made such thin notes of facts which he could carry in his head, or whether they would have had any chance of survival until the time of Diodorus. Nor can they be ascribed to Diyllus Syntaxis I; for the passage 7, 2 describes the stasis in Euboea (which ended in victory for Athens) as a draw, the notes on Philip express admiration of his achievements, and the passage 52, 9 summarizes the

¹ Cavaignac, *op. cit.* pp. 152-53 excludes Diyllus with the arguments, (1) that a Hellenistic writer must give Macedonia prior place, and (2) that the influence of the Attic orators which characterizes Hellenistic history is not apparent in Diodorus; of these arguments the first is illogical,

the second untrue (e.g. 54, 4; 84, 4). It has been suggested that the words *Κελτική μάχαιρα* (94, 3) imply knowledge of the Celtic invasion of 279 B.C., and Diyllus was probably alive at that date.

² Except the Sicilian narrative, which will be discussed in Article II.

complete subjection of Chalcidice, while the excerpt from Diyllus which follows (53-55) begins with the early stages of the Olynthian war.¹ And lastly they cannot be given to the chronographic source; for not only are they fuller than the chronographic excerpts (e.g. 36, 2-5) but they mention an incident which recurs in the chronographic excerpts (34, 5 and 31, 6).

It seems probable that Diodorus has drawn the history of events, which were not covered by the history of Ephorus and were difficult to excerpt from the verbose supplement of Diyllus, from a short text-book giving the bare bones of the period; such a text-book is preserved in the Oxyrhynchus Papyri I no. XII.² While shorter than the passages in Diodorus, it has the same type of narration and two traits in common with them; it has praise for Philip (Χαιρωνία ἐπιφανεστάτην μάχην Col. II 31: περὶ Χαιρώνειαν . . . ἐπιφανεστάτας πόλεις καταπεληγμένους D. 89, 1; and cf. Col. III 9 with D. 89, 3) and mentions philosophers (D. 52, 9 mentions Stageira alone of the Chalcidian cities—presumably because it was known as the birthplace of Aristotle). The author of the text-book used by Diodorus must remain anonymous.

And lastly, the Epilogue (95). Diodorus gives us his reflections on the achievements of Philip, summarizing the theme foreshadowed in the Proem and so ill maintained in his book and eking out his ideas with a repetition of the (historically worthless³) remark that Philip counted himself τοῖς δώδεκα θεοῖς σύνθρονον, and with some of the stock sayings of Philip.⁴

In Article II, when the Sicilian narrative has been considered, a summary of the conclusions from Book XVI will be appended.

N. G. L. HAMMOND.

CLARE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

¹ Having written τὰς Χαλκιδίικας πόλεις in 52, 9 D. opens 53 with the attack on Micyberna and Torone as τὰς ἐφ' Ἑλλησπόντῳ πόλεις.

² Bilabel, *Die kleineren Historikerfragmente auf Papyrus*, pp. 36 f.

³ Wilcken, *Alexander the Great* p. 211, Nock in *Harvard Studies Class. Phil.* XLI (1930), and Momigliano, *Filippo il macedone* pp. 175 f. have used this as evidence for an early example of ruler-cult; it is repeated from 92, 5, which from its general

context is derived from a Hellenistic author (as I think, Diyllus), who would only be too apt to invent what is in itself an anachronism. On the other hand, the passage recording the heroization of Dion (20, 6), which is used by Charlesworth in *Harvard Theol. Rev.* XXVIII no. I p. 12, derives from Theopompus XLI and may be regarded as reliable: cf. Article II.

⁴ They recur in Plutarch's *Apophthegmata* and in Polyaeus.

Γυναικὸς ἀνδρόβουλον ἐλπίζον κέαρ (*AGAMEMNON* l. 11).

MOST critics agree with varying emphasis that this is one of the most significant lines in the Watchman's speech, because of its emphasis on Clytaemnestra's unique masculinity. But the same interpreters widely disagree in deciding what exactly was her most masculine trait. In other words the meaning of the -βουλον part of the compound is in dispute. Here are some English renderings: 'whose *will* is as a man's' (Platt); 'manly' (Sidgwick); 'with man's *resolve*' (Lawson); 'into the council of men' (Verrall); 'man-passionéd' (Murray); 'man's *mind*' and 'man-like *spirit*' (Headlam); 'manly-counselling' (Paley); 'shrewd-purposed as a man's' (Tucker). Thus, as my italics show, we have *will*, *resolve*, *passion*, *mind*, *spirit*, *counsel*, and *purpose*, a pretty array of would-be synonyms, for the Greek -βουλον, an area whose semantic termini are βούλομαι = *I wish* and βουλευόμεμαι = *I deliberate, plan*. The purpose of this article is to show that every ounce of interpretative weight must be put into insistence on the second meaning, and that unless this be done (and it has not been done by English editors) appreciation of two important motifs in the play will be impaired. The scholiast saw that βουλευόμεμαι was the operative element in ἀνδρόβουλον, and wrote τὸ μείζονα ἢ κατὰ γυναῖκα βουλευόμενον ἢ κατὰ ἀνδρὸς βουλευομένης.¹ His second alternative is otiose but scarcely culpable in the light of Aeschylus' amazing exploitation of verbal ambiguity throughout this play.²

Properly interpreted the line contains a suppressed antithesis, as Verrall (in spite of his eccentric rendering), and most other editors, could not fail to observe. But it is a double antithesis. Besides ἀνὴρ/γυνή there is also βουλή/ἐλπίς. We may paraphrase thus:³

'She is a woman but with manly traits, to a woman's irrational hopes she adds the deliberate and purposive resolution of a man.' ἐλπίς is arbitrary and its physical seat is the κέαρ; βούλησις is rational, coming from the φρένες (see 995 φρένες are τελεσφόροι, but τὰ ἐλπίδος ψύθη may fall ἐς τὸ μὴ τελεσφόρον). Aristotle in his *Metaphysica* XI, VII, 2, and *De Anima* III, X, 4, and Plato in the *Gorgias*, p. 466, make it quite clear that βούλησις is a *reasoned* design for a certain τέλος, unlike ἐπιθυμία which is παρὰ τὸν λογισμὸν.

For two reasons this special attention to the essential implicates of ἀνδρόβουλον is desirable. The first I can only mention, postponing a full investigation; since βούλησις implies recognition of a definite τέλος, this line first introduces the insistent emphasis which Aeschylus gives in the trilogy to the working out of some kind of divine (transcending each human) purpose in the drama. τέλος or a word of similar force occurs over twenty times in an emphatic position in the *Agamemnon*—that is, it has almost the frequency of σοφός and its cognates in Euripides' *Bacchae*. It is true that each character has his or her own peculiar idea of the proper τέλος of his or her action, but above all runs Aeschylus' own conception of 'the one increasing purpose.' In the line we are examining ἀνδρόβουλον is the first statement that Clytaemnestra's heart is resolutely fixed with masculine perseverance on her private τέλος until she can say—

¹ See also Phrynichus, fr. ap. Bekker, pp. 19, 23, ἀνδρόβουλος γυνή· ἢ ἀνδρὸς βουλευήματα βουλευομένη.

² See κῆδος (699), τεκνόποινος (155), γυναικοποιῶν

(225), and Lawson's brilliant note on 136.

³ I must neglect the difficulties of κρατεῖ in the previous line and the doubt cast on ἐλπίζον.

The emphasis contained woman a hopes; fin clearly on the beaco

and third punishme actions as conventioness—'ho audience shrewd p

I thi βουλή wit character, optative a compared (compare fear are t terror en scrupulou

POST etymology from cog 'Renown like this i

TRINITY

ἔμοι δ' ἄγὼν ὅδ' οὐκ ἀφρόντιστος πάλαι
 νείκης παλαιᾶς ἦλθε σὺν χρόνῳ γε μὴν·
 ἔσθηκα δ' ἔνθ' ἔπαισ' ἐπ' ἐξείργασμένοις.

The second reason why the antithesis between βουλεύομαι and ἐλπίζω deserves emphasis is this: it is only by bitter πᾶθος that the Chorus at length learns the μάθος contained in ἀνδρόβουλον, the fact that Clytaemnestra is not just an over-sanguine woman after all. On three occasions they are loth to trust this woman's eager hopes; first when they have heard her ὀλολυγμός of joy (see 270, the emphasis is clearly on the μὴ πεπνυμένη), secondly when they have considered the likelihood of the beacon-sign—

γυναικὸς αἰχμῇ πρέπει
 πρὸ τοῦ φανέντος χάριν ξυναινέσαι.
 πιθανὸς ἄγαν ὁ θῆλυς ἔρος ἐπινέμεται
 ταχύπορος (ll. 483-486)

and thirdly (1410) when they think that Clytaemnestra cannot escape immediate punishment for her crime. In every instance they are judging Clytaemnestra's actions as the result of ἐλπίς and ἐπιθυμία, not of βούλησις and λογισμός. To their conventional minds the only alternative to humility in a woman was arbitrary wilfulness—'hoc volo, sic iubeo, sit pro ratione voluntas.' It was important that the audience should appreciate the irony of this attitude. Hence the plain words of the shrewd palace guard.

I think that this formidable synthesis of the usually antithetical masculine βουλή with feminine ἐλπίς explains much of the seeming ἀνωμαλία of Clytaemnestra's character, especially in the later part of the play where she vacillates between the optative and indicative mood, e.g. 1659 εἰ δέ τοι μόχθων γένοιτο τῶνδ' ἄλις δεχοίμεθ' ἄν compared with the domineering 1672-3, ἐγὼ καὶ σὺ θήσομεν κρατοῦντε τῶνδε δωμάτων (compare also 340 sqq. with 1421 and 1570 sqq.). And if elements of both pity and fear are to be discerned in the portrayal of such a νηλὴς γυνή, her βούλησις provokes terror enough in the *Agamemnon*, while in the *Choëphoroe* even the most morally scrupulous can hardly refuse some pity for the stilling of that ἐλπίζον κέαρ.

POSTSCRIPT: In the light of this would it be too rash to suggest another etymology for the name Clytaemnestra (as most of the Aeschylus passages spell it)?—from cognates of κλυτός and μήστωρ in the feminine = 'Deviser of famed deeds,' 'Renowned as a schemer,' i.e. κλυτόβουλος. Could Aeschylus have had something like this in mind? As a fit name for such a woman compare Medea.

W. BEDELL STANFORD.

TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

THE CHORUS OF ALCMAN'S *PARTHENEION*.

THE irregular division of vv. 35 sqq. between two semi-choruses seems to be widely accepted and approved.² I wish first to discuss the obvious objection that such an irregular division is unparalleled in a strophic chorus,³ and secondly to show that the reasons advanced for the division are themselves insufficient.

A. DIVISION OF SPEAKERS IN STROPHIC CHORUSES.

The violent irregularity of the proposed division in the *Partheneion* awakens uncomfortable misgivings even in its advocates. But we are offered no parallels. We have examples of *corresponding* divisions in strophe and antistrophe quoted to us, and we are invited to read the views of Headlam on two passages of Aeschylus. Finally we are countered by general opinions of uncertain validity: Alcman's art is much less formal than that of Pindar or the Tragedians; the chorus of Hagesichora treats 'strophic pedantry' with a freedom as remarkable as that with which it treats the charm of its leaders. But, we may ask in all humility, what are the facts? Is there, or is there not, any parallel to this irregular division? If there is not, we may be justified in leaving our opponents to their pangs of conscience, those thorns that in their bosom lodge to prick and sting them.

The strophes of tragedy are not often divided between different speakers (except in a *Kommos*). When they are, we usually find (even in a *Kommos*) an exactly corresponding division in the antistrophes. Such a corresponding division occurs almost certainly at A. Eum. 143 sqq., certainly at Eur. Alk. 86 sqq., Hik. 598 sqq., Ion 205 sqq., Rhes. 692 sqq. (At a number of other places the division is much more hypothetical—e.g. Alk. 212 sqq., 872 sqq., Hipp. 141 sqq., H. 348 sqq. Sometimes the division is between semichoruses, sometimes between single speakers. At Ion 184-203 all that is *certain* is that the first strophe and antistrophe are sung by two different groups.)

Division of speakers often occurs in choral lyrics which are not in strophe-antistrophe formation. Certain examples are A. ScT 78 sqq., 1071 sqq.; Eum. 254 sqq., S. Ai. 866 sqq.; Eur. Ba. 576 sqq., Rhes. 674 sqq. (Much more hypothetical are Hipp. 811 sqq., 866 sqq., Hik. 271 sqq., H. 875 sqq., 1016 sqq., Tro. 1226 sqq., I.T. 123 sqq., 651 sqq., Ba. 977 sqq.; A.ScT 848 sqq., Agam. 475 sqq. (probable). Naturally the question of *correspondence* does not arise here; but a certain *symmetry* can always be observed even in these examples.

We have now to enquire whether there are any places where the text of our MSS., or of modern scholars, if it is to be retained, demands an *irregular* division, i.e. places where the division made in the strophe does not correspond to that made in the antistrophe. The answer is that there are several such places, most of them undetected even by those who advocate irregular division in Alcman's *Partheneion*. I

¹ I am greatly indebted to Mr. J. D. Denniston for much valuable criticism and advice.

² Blass, *Rh. Mus.*, xxxiii 553 sqq.; J. T. Sheppard, *Essays and Studies presented to Sir William Ridgeway*, 124 sqq.; C. M. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry*, 35 sqq.

³ I use the phrase 'strophic chorus' to mean

a composition of either triadic or strophe-antistrophe formation in a lyric metre. By 'irregular division' I mean a division of speakers in a strophe (or antistrophe) which is not repeated in the same place or places of the antistrophe (or strophe).

consider f
those for v

I. A. Hik
Head

Now altho
could be
expedients
generally j
at least ne
agree with
parodos of

II. A. Ch
Headl

This exam
generally a
text: it is
(b) that it i
δῖος ἐπεικός
i.e. in his a
not includ
therefore al
the conduct
of this diffi

III. S. OK
Pearso

and in the

As printed,
make it imp
v. 882 regu

IV. S. OK
Pearso

Here too th
probably ri
irregular di

consider first those for which the evidence seems to me insufficient, and secondly those for which the evidence seems to me considerable or decisive.

I. A. Hik. 86-7.

Headlam (*C.R.* XIV p. 197) divided thus :

α'. εἴθ' εἴη Διὸς εὖ παναληθῶς—
β'. Διὸς ἡμερος οὐκ εὐθιήρατος ἐτύχθη.

Now although this division is admittedly no less *possible* than a score of others which could be introduced into our texts without difficulty, there are several other expedients at hand for the cure of these lines, some at least equally possible, a few generally judged to be a great deal more probable. So dubious an hypothesis could at least never be used as evidence elsewhere. In fact I expect many scholars will agree with me that this isolated interruption in the middle of an otherwise uniform parodos of 175 lines is exceedingly improbable.

II. A. Cho. 621 sqq.

Headlam (*loc. cit.*) divided thus :

621 α'. ἐπεὶ δ' ἐπεμνησάμην ἀμειλίχων
πόνων— β'. ἀκαίρως δέ. δυσφιλὲς κτλ. . . .
. . . γυναικείαν ἀτολμον αἰχμάν.
629 α'. κακῶν δὲ πρεσβύεται κτλ.

This example need not be taken very seriously, for (a) it is a mere conjecture, not generally accepted, and depending on two emendations of an admittedly corrupt text: it is thus only one expedient among many for emending a difficult passage: (b) that it is a highly inadvisable expedient is proved by Headlam's rendering of his δῆλως ἐπαικτικῶς σέβεις in 625: 'do you hold in admiration which befits enemies . . .?', i.e. in his attack upon Clytemnestra the first speaker has adduced parallels which do not include the special complication of her love-affairs. The second speaker is therefore alleged to interrupt and charge the first speaker with 'holding in admiration' the conduct of Clytemnestra! I am not acquainted with any more fantastic solution of this difficulty.

III. S. OK 840 and 882.

Pearson reads :

840 στρ. Χο. χαλᾶν λέγω σοι· Κρ. σοὶ δ' ἔγωγ' ὁδοιπορεῖν.

and in the corresponding line of the antistrophe :

882 αντ. Κρ. Ζεὺς ταῦτ' ἂν εἰδείη, σὺ δ' οὐ.

As printed, the division is irregular : but the obvious shortcomings of v. 882 in MSS. make it impossible for us to use this passage as evidence elsewhere. Jebb makes v. 882 regular : Χο. <Ζεὺς μοι ξυνίστω.> Κρ. Ζεὺς γ' ἂν εἰδείη, σὺ δ' οὐ.

IV. S. OK 1725 and 1739.

Pearson reads :

1725 στρ. Αν. ἡμερος ἔχει με. Ισ. τίς; <φράσον>.
1739 αντ. Χο. καὶ πάρος ἀπεφύγετον. Αν. <τὸ τί>;.

Here too the obvious corruption of the text (Jebb again makes the divisions correspond, probably rightly) prevents us from putting much confidence in this example of irregular division.

V. Eur. Hik. 618 sqq.

If MSS. are retained, there is an irregular division: 620 and 621 cannot be said by the same person, whereas 628 and 629 undoubtedly are said by the same person. But the change of *σε* to *με* in 620 (Hermann, almost universally accepted) is very simple and restores perfect correspondence (627 may well be given to the speaker of 626). This is therefore a highly dubious case: the change of a single letter disposes of it.

VI. H. 735 sqq.

740-1 are said by one person: 754-6 are divided among two persons (747-8 by one person, 760-2 probably also by one). This is a special case of irregular division of iambs interposed among corresponding lyrics. Since two iambs are answered by three, this must be considered an irregular division *outside* the strophe-antistrophe arrangement; the example is therefore irrelevant here. (Cf. Ion 205 sqq.)

VII. Ion 205 sqq.

As soon as we emend the corrupt line 222 in such a way that 223 *begins* the Chorus' speech, this ceases to be an example. The lines should probably run:

Ιω. οὐ θέμις ὦ ξέναι.
Χο. ἐκ σέθεν ἂν πυθοίμεθ' αὐδάν.

οὐδ' ἂν (MSS. after ξέναι) I take to have arisen *either* from a dittography of αὐδάν, *or* from οὐδόν, intended as a supplement in 221 (θέμις γνάλων ἔπερ- | βῆναι λευκῇ ποδί γ' οὐδόν). Notice that although Ion's verses break up the antistrophe into six instalments, these breaks occur in such places that the six instalments correspond exactly to the necessary divisions between speakers in the strophe.

VIII. Ion 695 sqq.

In Murray's text, the divisions in the antistrophe are irregular. Those in vv. 702, 704, 705, 711 I regard as unnecessary: the others (those in vv. 699, 700, 701) deserve attention. The case in their favour is (a) πόσιν in 697 seems to begin a sentence which is not completed, (b) πόσις δ' in 700 seems to do the same, for *Xouthos* cannot be called 'dishonoured by his friends' in this context. But this is not a very strong case, for (b) in 700-1, πόσις δ' ἀτίετος φίλων = 'her husband *dishonours* those dear to him': for the active sense of ἀτίετος cf. ἀνατος active A. Hik. 356, *passive* Agam. 1211. So Hermann, Wilamowitz and L. and S.⁹; cf. Kühner I ii 289.

(a) In 696 sqq. the solution is perhaps not very far away. We want a verb, governed by γεγωνήσομεν, with πόσιν for subject and τάδε for object, with the general sense 'do', 'dare'; I suggest that the verb is TOAMAN, and that it is barely concealed in TAAMON, v. 698. The simplest confusion of letters will account for the change.

IX. Hik. 42 sqq.

This is a very difficult and doubtful case. In Murray's text there is an irregular division in v. 45. All other editors believe the words to be corrupt—Murray himself admits this possibility. True, it is uncommonly difficult to say what the emendation shall be, or even where the corruption lies: I wondered for a time whether there was not some plausibility in ἄνα μοι νεκρά λῦσαι φθιμμένων τεκνῶν οἱ καταλ. etc.; but νεκρά as plural of νεκρός is otherwise found only in much later authors. ἄνα μοι τέκνα λῦσαι φθιμμένων νεκρῶν μὴ καταλείπουσα μέλη (Parmentier-Grégoire) is pretty, though I find it unconvincing. But though the true solution may not yet have been discovered, I heartily approve the general scepticism about these very abrupt and unusual 'clamores confusos precantium'. Certainly, in the face of so much doubt, no scholar (εἰ μὴ θέσιν διαφυλάττων) would dream of using the passage as evidence elsewhere.

It remains to consider half a dozen passages in which irregular division is certain or probable.

I. There is a class of instances which can be put aside at once as irrelevant. This is the class of special cases in which there is a division of speakers in the strophe (or antistrophe), but no division at all in the antistrophe (or strophe). These are cases of division in strophe + no division in antistrophe, not of lack of correspondence between divisions in strophe and antistrophe.

The first clear example of this is Med. 1271 sqq. Others are (probably) Hipp. 362 sqq. (= 669 sqq.), Or. 1537 sqq. (= 1353 sqq.), Rhes. 23 sqq. In these last three instances the division of speakers seems highly probable: in Hipp. 362 sqq. the beginnings of sentences coincide with the beginnings of lines; the sentences are mostly questions or exclamations; when they are statements, they begin with that asyndeton which is most easily explained by change of speaker. Cf. Or. 1537: asyndeton again at 1543, 1545, after a question (1539) and an exclamatory imperative (1541): beginnings of lines coincide with beginnings of sentences. Both here and in Hipp. 362 sqq. the *last* sentence is the only one which has a connecting particle: both here and in Hipp. 362 sqq. the antistrophe is very widely separated from its strophe.

II. A. Hik. 1052 sqq.

str.	a. ὁ μέγας Ζεὺς ἀπαλέξαι γάμον Αἰγυπτογενῇ μοι.	1052
	β. τὸ μὲν ἄν βέλτατον εἶη· σὺ δὲ θέλγοις ἄν ἄθελκτον.	1055
	α. σὺ δέ γ' οὐκ οἶσθα τὸ μέλλον.	
antistr.	β. τί δὲ μέλλω φρένα Δίαν καθορᾶν, ὅψιν ἄβυσσον; μέτριον νῦν ἔπος εὖχου.	
	α. τίνα καιρόν με διδάσκεις;	1060
	β. τὰ θεῶν μηδὲν ἀγάζειν.	

See Tucker's commentary. This arrangement undoubtedly gives the best sequence of thoughts. Other treatments of the passage seem much less convincing:

(a) The objection to the regular division in Sidgwick's text is that it gives 1059-60 to the same speaker: but 1060 must surely be a *reply* to 1059, a demand for an explanation of it. (b) Others divide speakers thus:—a. 1052-3: β. 1054: α. 1055: β. 1056—α. 1057-8: β. 1059: α. 1060: β. 1061. The objection is that 1054-5 ought to be said by the same speaker:—'well, that *would* be best: but you are only trying to move the unmovable'. With 1054 in this sense, 1055 is extremely inconsequential if separated from it and given to another speaker (v. Wilamowitz). If τὸ μὲν ἄν βέλτατον εἶη is taken as 'it may all turn out for the best' (v. Paley), 1055 need not be given to the same speaker, and a regular division is obtained: but it seems a very forced translation of 1054. (c) If 1054 is given to the speaker of 1052-3, a regular division can be obtained (α. 1052-4: β. 1055: α. 1056—β. 1057-9: α. 1060: β. 1061). But this also seems less natural.

I feel a considerable doubt about this passage for the reason that I think 1059 ought not to be given to the speaker of 1057-8. If that is so, then the speaker of 1059 must also be the speaker of 1061, 1056 and 1054: the other lines, including 1055, must then be given to the other speaker; and this revives the difficulty of separating 1054 from 1055, a difficulty which at present I see no way of solving.

This passage may therefore be called a fairly probable example of irregular division.

III. Tro. 159 sqq.

str.	Εκ. ὦ τέκν', 'Αργείων πρὸς ναῦς ἦδη κινεῖται κωπήρης χεῖρ. —οἱ ἐγώ, τί θέλουσ'; ἡ ποῦ μ' ἦδη ναυσθλώσουσιν πατρίας ἐκ γᾶς;	159
antistr.	Εκ. ὦ τέκνον, ὀρθρεῖον σὺν ψυχάν. —ἐκπληχθεῖς ἦλθον φρίκη. —ἦδη τις ἔβα Δαναῶν κῆρυξ; τῷ πρόσκειμαι δούλα τλάμων;	182

Irregularity here can only be avoided by bold emendation (of v. 183, v. Prinz-Wecklein) or by Murray's unconvincing device at v. 160. Irregular division seems highly probable here, indeed almost certain. It is by no means impossible that 185 should be given to a new speaker, thus increasing the irregularity. In 159 the unmetrical ὦ τέκν', 'Αργείων should, I think, be ὦ τέκν', 'Αχαιῶν. The Greeks are normally called 'Argives' in this passage, a fact which would facilitate the substitution here; to say nothing of the literal similarity of the words. ('Αχαιῶν πλάτας I.A. 172, πλάτας 'Αχαιῶν Tro. 1332.)

IV. Tro. 197 sqq.

In Murray's text, the division of vv. 199-210 is irregular. The *paragraphi* apposed to vv. 201, 202, 204, 205, 207, 210 cannot be considered *necessary*; the passage reads easily without them. But the division at 199 is much more plausible. If 197-8 are spoken to Hecuba, 199 sqq. follows inconsequently; and ποίοις in 197 would (as Wecklein saw) have been οἷοις. If they are *not* spoken to Hecuba, they must be spoken to a member of the chorus who replies with vv. 199 sqq. And if we admit this *paragraphos* at 199, we may more easily admit the others also (though their *disposition* is a matter for further argument). Some edd. have emended the irregular division out of existence: but the balance of probability is in its favour here.

V. Tro. 587 sqq.

str.	Αν. μόλοις ὦ πόσις μοι. Εκ. βοᾷς τὸν παρ' Αἰῖδα παῖδ' ἐμόν, ὦ μελέα; Αν. σᾶς δάμαρτος ἄλκαρ	587 590
antistr.	Εκ. σὺ τ' ὦ λῦμα 'Αχαιῶν τέκνων δέσποθ' ἁμῶν πρεσβυγενὲς Πρίαμε, κοίμισαί μ' ἐς Αἶδον.	

Here the arrangement of the strophe is certain. The antistrophe, as it stands, has no corresponding division of speakers. 592-3 cannot, in this form, be given to Andromache, because *she* cannot possibly call Priam τέκνων δέσποθ' ἁμῶν, though I think *Hecuba* can well call him 'Lord and Master of our children'. It is possible to emend 592 in such a way as to make the line suitable to Andromache's utterance: τεκὼν δ' Ἔκτορ' ἐμόν (Murray), τεκὼν δεσπότην μου (Parmentier-Grégoire). But there seems no obvious reason (except prejudice about irregular division) for emending: λῦμα 'Αχαιῶν is rather an odd description of Priam (λῦμα passive)—Denniston would avoid the strangeness by making τεκὼν (for τέκνων) govern λῦμα [we should then have to read δέσποθ' ἁμῶν]. But I think we must accept two facts: (a) as 591-4 stand, they must all be spoken by Hecuba, (b) 591-4 are translatable without emendation, and corruption is very far from certain. So far we must concede that this is a highly probable example of irregular division.

VI. Rh.

Th
But theSo
strophie
Sophoc
all in th
is a cer
scale.Alcman
reckless
Parthen
thought
elabora

B

It

does su
strong
little
suggest
vv. 70-
little di
a pass
Thulak
mine, F
were p
Chorus
παρθέν
doing th
ever ou
remnan
her', bu
overloo
danger
to the c

An

opponer
depreca
Ten sh
instead
call the
into riv
of victo
latter aTh
that 'in
οὔτε μωI rep
competit

VI. Rhes. 526 sqq.

The divisions of 538-41 do not correspond to those of 557-61. A certain example. But the date and authorship of *Rhesos* are still disputable.

So it appears that there is one quite probable instance of irregular division in a strophic chorus in Aeschylus, and that in his earliest extant play. There is none in Sophocles. In Euripides, there are three highly probable, if not certain, examples—all in the same play, *Troiaides*. In *Rhesos*, a play of uncertain date and authorship, there is a certain example. In each instance the irregularity is on an extremely small scale. There is nothing really parallel to the proposed division of speakers in Alcman's *Partheneion*. That division is unique (a) in its early date, (b) in its extremely reckless irregularity, (c) almost, but not quite, in being irregular at all. The *Partheneion* is the earliest extant poem in the triadic structure: one would have thought that the form was still too young to permit this extra and extraordinary elaboration.

B. INSUFFICIENCY OF THE REASONS FOR DIVISION OF SPEAKERS IN THE *PARTHENEION*.

It is clear that nobody would ever have proposed or supported a view which does such violence to the conventions of strophic poetry unless there had been some strong and definite reason for doing so. It is not enough to allege that there is 'too little corporate feeling' in the poem. Above all we must vigorously deny the suggestion that these young women ought not to describe themselves in the terms of vv. 70-7. It may be merely a matter of opinion: but many of us will, I hope, find little difficulty in believing that the girls may without too much immodesty sing a passage which runs: 'Not even Nanno's hair, nor Areta divinely fair, nor Thulakis nor Kleesithera: nor will you go to Ainesimbrotas and say "let Astaphis be mine, Philulla gaze on me, and Damareta and lovely Vianthemis"'. Even if they were praising themselves, I confess that I should not feel much incongruity (the Chorus of *The Phoinissai* can call themselves *καλλιστεῖματα* and refer to their *παρθένιον χλιδὸν κόμας*: examples can be multiplied). But since in fact they are doing the opposite, since they are saying in effect 'We are not beautiful enough; whatever our charm, it would not avail us if Hagesichora were not our leader', the last remnant of doubt must disappear. Areta is not saying 'Areta is beautiful: look at her', but 'Beautiful Areta is not good enough'. To deny the likelihood of this is to overlook the playful, almost coquettish, tone of this part of the poem, and to be in danger of requiring a standard of self-effacing austerity which is wholly inappropriate to the circumstances.

And here I must object to another difficulty in the theory. If it seems to my opponents unlikely that the maidens should indulge in this pleasantly coquettish deprecation of their charms, it seems to me infinitely improbable that the chorus of Ten should separate into two semichoral Fives which try to outdo each other, instead of standing together against their real rivals, the opposing chorus. They call themselves a *παίδων δεκάς*, a team of Ten, not *παίδων δύο πεμπτάδες*. The division into rival semichoruses seems to me incredible on this ground alone. Their prospects of victory over their common rivals must have been poor indeed, unless by chance the latter adopted the same remarkable tactics.¹

The one really serious argument in favour of the division of speakers is the fact that 'in two places (vv. 39-43 *ἔγων δ' αἰδῶ Ἀγιδῶς τὸ φῶς . . . ἐμὲ δ' οὐτ' ἐπαινῆν οὐτε μωμῆσθαι νιν ἄ . . . χοραγὸς . . . ἔη* and 85-87 *ἔγων μὲν αὐτὰ . . . ἔγων δὲ . . .*)

¹ I regard it as certain that this chorus is in not believe that *ἐνρί δ' ἐνδεκα* (v. 98) can mean competition with another chorus, although I do 'against eleven'.

the natural stress of the Greek implies a contrast between two persons or groups. The answer is as follows:

(a) vv. 39-43. That ἐμέ δὲ κτλ. does not imply a contrast of its speaker with the speaker of the preceding ἐγὼν δὲ can easily be proved.

ἐμέ is here contrasted with αὐτά below (δοκεῖ γὰρ ἡμεν αὐτά).—‘She does not need my praise: for she is *herself* pre-eminent’. νιν is of course Agido, so is αὐτά: cf. Schol. 39 ἀρχὴ τῶν Ἀγιδούς ἐπαίνων; the end of her praise is presumably the end of the triad (v. 49): cf. Piccolomini, *Studi di fil. gr.* I 193 sqq., Sitzler, *Phil. Rundsch.* III 1883 929 sqq., van Groningen *Mnemos.* 1936 247 sqq., who rightly insist on this view: ἡ κλεινὰ χορογός is Hagesichora, who tells the chorus that they are wasting their time praising Agido: Agido does not need *their* praise, she is *herself* pre-eminent. It is reasonable that it should be Hagesichora, the chorus-leader, who warns her chorus that it is wasting its time.

(b) 85 sqq. The argument from this passage involves a serious misinterpretation. If one person or group says ἐγὼν μὲν κτλ. and another says ἐγὼν δὲ κτλ., the contrast is spurious and artificial. For of course they must *both* admit that they sing badly compared with their leaders, and *both* must be eager to please the Goddess: yet the alleged interruption and spirit of rivalry make the second speaker say in effect ‘I on the other hand sing beautifully; and, unlike you, am eager to please the Goddess’. This is not, I think, hypercritical: it is indeed the obvious implication as well as the real meaning of the contrast which would be created by division of speakers here.

Again the αὐτά points to the correct interpretation. ἐγὼν μὲν αὐτά must mean here ‘I as opposed to Hagesichora, my leader (just mentioned in the vocative χοροστάτης)’. It is clearly an understood <σὺ δὲ καλῶς αἰεῖς> which answers the μὲν. N.b. that γλαῦξ . . . λέλακα does not merely mean ‘I sing badly’, but also ‘my song is ill-omened, will mar our prayer’ (van Groningen loc. cit.): ἐγὼν μὲν αὐτά must then imply an answering Ἀγησιχόρα δέ: αὐτά must mean ‘without the aid of Hagesichora.’ Then ἐγὼν δὲ resumes naturally the subject of the first clause: ‘I, as opposed to you, sing badly: but that same poor singer, myself, has the will to please’. (This is not an instance of *anaphora* with μὲν and δέ.)

It is thus reasonably certain that the *Partheneion* is sung by the whole chorus (of ten girls, the παίδων δεκάς of v. 98). Hagesichora is leader, Agido second in command. How much of vv. 35 sqq. (if any part of it) is sung by these two remains uncertain. Probably they sing no part of it: they stand side by side and pray (80, 82). Their chorus is singing in rivalry against another chorus.

C. TWO POINTS OF INTERPRETATION.

I. 45 sqq. ἵπποπεριδίων ὀνείρων is not really difficult. Three objections have been brought against the interpretation of ἵππον τῶν ἵππο. ὀνείρων:

(a) That it could only mean ‘a horse belonging to the class of winged dreams’: and this would imply ‘familiarity of the poet . . . with the notion of horses born of dreams, or of horses born of a certain class of dreams, winged’.¹ And there is of course no evidence that poets were familiar with such a notion.

This is merely a misconception. The phrase implies familiarity with the notion of a certain class of *dreams*, viz. winged ones; not with the notion of a certain class of *horses*. And this class, viz. the *winged* class of dreams, was indeed a familiar notion: Sheppard himself quotes half a dozen instances of reference to it.

The word τῶν is only a supplement to the Papyrus text; but a very plausible supplement, being part of the phrase as quoted in Et. Magn. 783. 20.

¹ Sheppard, loc. cit.

(b) It is alleged that the reference must be uncomplimentary, because it is normally unflattering in Greek to be compared to a dream. This may be true, but is certainly quite irrelevant. The question is in fact, can *things seen in dreams* be called in some sense better than their living counterparts? As a matter of fact, they obviously can be; as a matter of Greek poetry, they frequently are so called. The women whom Atossa saw in her dream were

εὐέμονε,
μεγέθει τε τῶν νῦν ἐκπρεπεστάτα πολὺ,
κάλλει τ' ἀμώμω. (Pers. 183-5.)

So Xerxes dreamed of a man μέγαν τε καὶ εὐεΐδεια (Hdt. VII 12, cf. V 56, Herondas VIII 16 the dreamer narrates that the goat which he saw was εὐπώγων τε κεύκρωσ τις). Cf. Apoll. Rhod. II 205

δαίνυντο Φινεὺς
ἀρπαλέως, οἷόν τ' ἐν ὀνείρασι θῦμον ἰαίνων.

It is really superfluous to quote a host of other examples, such as Theokritos IX 16-7

ἔχω δέ τοι ὅσσ' ἐν ὀνείρῳ
φαίνονται, πολλὰς μὲν οἷς πολλὰς δὲ χιμαίρας.

(There, it is said, 'the matter is still one of quantity, not quality'.¹ No: the matter is still one of general excellence compared with the state of real objects: the distinction between quantity and quality in such a case is irrelevant. And even that distinction does not apply to the example quoted from *The Persae*.)

(c) It is further alleged that winged dreams are still worse, being 'transient, cheating, swift to fly away'.¹ This is another misconception. In Greek, winged dreams are often, if not normally, dreams in which good visions disappear too quickly. The wingedness of the dreams is bad and blameworthy precisely because the visions which they so swiftly remove are good. Youth is not the less desirable because it is 'shortlived as a dream' (Theognis 1020, Theokr. XXVI 8): Odysseus' mother was no less dear to him because she vanished 'like a dream' (Od. XI. 207): the 'good vision' of the chorus in *Agamemnon* (443) was none the less good because it vanished on wings down the ways of sleep. Numerous references prove that it is normally the good vision which is winged, or seen in a winged dream (cf. further Bion 1. 58, Theokr. XXIX 28; Eur. fr. 420, 518, etc.). The duration of a dream does not adversely affect the quality of the vision contained in it. The fact that it only lasted a moment, undoubtedly a disadvantage in a real horse, has no adverse bearing on the quality of the dream-horse. The chorus sings wistfully of a vision such as one might glimpse for a moment in a fleeting dream, the creature of a dream's brief fairyland. You may blame the dream for not lasting longer, but (in Greek) you normally do so precisely because the objects which appear in it are good and desirable, and you would like them to stay longer.

II. vv. 58-9. These lines mean: 'she who is second in beauty after Agido will only be the equal of (not superior to) her opposite number in the rival choir': she will 'run as one good racer against another equally good racer'. Hagesichora and Agido are the most beautiful, and will surpass their opposite numbers in the rival chorus: the rest can all be dismissed together briefly, because even the best of them (she who is next on the list after Agido, whoever she may be) is only equally matched with her opposite number. This insufficiency of the rest of the chorus is then developed at length in the next triad.

DENYS PAGE.

CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD.

¹ Sheppard, loc. cit.

THE CAREER OF SEX. JULIUS FRONTINUS.

It is a well-known fact that of the three governors of Britain who were responsible for the Flavian advance of the northern frontier two had had previous military experience in the area in which they were now called upon to operate. Petilius Cerialis was in command of the IXth legion during the critical times of Boudicca's revolt (Tac. *Ann.* XIV. 32). And although in that capacity he succeeded in losing the larger part of his forces, his subsequent appointment by Vespasian to the command of the army despatched to reconquer the Rhine frontier from the revolted Civilis suggests that his military record was more distinguished than Tacitus would imply. Agricola has still better claims to be considered as a British specialist. In 61 as *tribunus militum* he was serving with distinction on the staff of Suetonius Paulinus in N. Wales (Tac. *Agr.* 5), and in 70 he was sent as *legatus legionis* to the XXth legion at Chester, in which capacity he served under Cerialis during the initial stages of the northward advance (Tac. *Agr.* 8). Of Julius Frontinus, the successor of Cerialis and predecessor of Agricola, we are less well informed; and it is the purpose of this note to show that in all probability he too had had previous military experience in Britain.

Of the early military service of Frontinus we have no knowledge. We first hear of him on January 1st A.D. 70, when as urban praetor he summoned the senate (Tac. *Hist.* IV. 39). This post he shortly resigned in favour of the young Domitian, and after that date we have only one elusive reference until his suffect consulship in 73. Following this he was early in 74 appointed governor of Britain in succession to Cerialis.¹

Frontinus himself informs us in the *strategemata* (4. III. 14) that he received the submission of the Lingones.² Of the precise circumstances he tells us no more than that he was acting *auspiciis Domitiani* and that the war was that against the revolted Civilis.³ It is generally recognized that Frontinus must have been *legatus legionis* upon this occasion.⁴ It can however I think be further inferred from the evidence afforded by the narrative of Tacitus that the legion which he was commanding was the IInd *Adjutrix*. That he held some command in Lower Germany is supported by an inscription found at Vetera,⁵ but this unfortunately does not make it clear whether he was at the time of the dedication *legatus legionis* or *legatus Aug. pr. pr.* of the army

¹ A certain . . .)ON(. . . was *cos. suff.* in July 74, *CIL.* I p. 59=VI 2016. But this can hardly have been Julius Frontinus, for Cerialis was already *cos.* II on May 21st 74, *CIL.* III p. 852 dipl. 9, and his successor must have been on the way to Britain if not already in the province. The consulship of Frontinus falls therefore in 73. It is not impossible that he should have held this purely qualifying honour *in absentia*, but the point is not here material.

² The authenticity of this book of the *Strategemata* has been challenged (see Schanz-Hosius, *R-Lit.-Gesch.* II (1935) 797 f. for the most recent review of the problem). There is not yet agreement on this point, and in the present note the orthodox attribution (supported by Kappelmacher, P.-W. s.v. Sex. Julius Frontinus) is

accepted. It must however be stressed that the validity of this note depends entirely upon the authorship of the passage in *Strategemata* IV, and any conclusions derived therefrom can only be accepted with reserve.

³ *Auspiciis Imperatoris Caesaris Domitiani Augusti Gemanici bello, quod Julius Civilis in Gallia moverat, Lingonum opulentissima civitas, quae ad Civilem desciverat, cum adveniente exercitu Caesaris populationem timeret, quod contra expectationem inviolata nihil ex rebus suis amiserat, ad obsequium redacta septuaginta milia armatorum tradidit mihi.*

⁴ Kappelmacher in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyklopädie*, s.v. Sex. Julius Frontinus.

⁵ *CIL.* XIII. 8624. I.O.M. 1)ONONI (MINER)VAE PRO(SAL.S)EXTI IUL. (FRO)NTINI.

in Lower Germany. Ritterling has suggested the latter,¹ assigning his command to the year 73/4, but there seems little to commend this hypothesis and the presence in the province of Frontinus as *legatus legionis II Adj.* would provide an alternative and satisfactory solution.²

In 70 A.D. the Lingones were in obstinate revolt and their suppression was it seems part of the task allotted to Cerialis (Tac. *Hist.* IV. 73). The precise moment at which this took place is not at once obvious. They seem to have made some sort of submission at the assembly held by Cerialis at Trèves (*Hist.* IV. 73-4; cf. IV. 76). But almost immediately afterwards they are to be found playing an active part along with the Ubii, Batavi, Bructeri and Tencteri in the assault upon Cerialis' camp on the Moselle (*Hist.* IV. 77). After this they disappear from the story. Cerialis, reinforced by the arrival of three legions, II *Adj.*, XIII *Gem.* and XIV *Gem.* (*Hist.* V. 14), followed up his victory and pursued Civilis to Vetera. The rest of the surviving section of Tacitus is concerned with operations on the lower Rhine, and the Lingones are not again mentioned. It is however reasonable to suppose that the reopening of the main road from Lyon and the west-Alpine passes to Trèves and the lower Rhine would have been one of Cerialis' first considerations if indeed it had not been already secured.

There seem thus to have been two occasions upon which the Lingones might have made some form of submission, the assembly held by Cerialis at Trèves and their final return to allegiance at some date after the battle on the Moselle. The movements of Cerialis' army are not stated in full by Tacitus. But if, as seems most probable, the army under Annian Gallus consisted at first of the two legions VIII *Aug.* and XI *Cl.*,³ Cerialis had with him at the outset no more than the single legion XXI *Rapax* and a force of auxiliary troops. With these he advanced by way of Vindonissa to Moguntiacum and thence to Trèves (*Hist.* IV. 70/72). At no time did he approach the territory of the Lingones, and this is confirmed by the security which the Mediomatrici could offer to the renegade legions (*Hist.* IV. 70). It is therefore impossible to regard Frontinus as the *legatus* of XXI. The essence of the story in the *Strategemata* is the presence of the Roman army within the territory of the Lingones. Nor is it likely that had the occasion to which he refers been the assembly at Trèves, their submission would have been made to a subordinate commander rather than to Cerialis himself.

Frontinus must therefore be speaking of the final submission of the Lingones after the battle on the Moselle rather than of the 'submission' which so shortly preceded their participation in that battle. It is hard to resist the conclusion that it was as commander of one of the legions which joined Cerialis subsequently to these events that Frontinus scored his bloodless victory. There were five such legions. The XIVth, under its commander Fabius Priscus, marched from Britain through the territory of the Nervii and of the Tungri to join Cerialis at Trèves (*Hist.* IV. 79). It is just possible, though surely improbable, that Frontinus would have spoken of the two Spanish legions as acting on this occasion *auspiciis Domitiani*. But it is not possible to see how Frontinus, who had only since the New Year vacated the urban praetorship in favour of Domitian, could already have been in command of one of these legions, nor why such an appointment should have been necessary.

¹ E. Ritterling, 'Sex. Julius Frontinus am unteren Rhein?', *BJ.* CXXXIII, 1928, 48-50; id., *Fasti des r. Deutschland unter den Prinzipat*, 57 f.

² R. Syme, *JRS.* XXIV, 1934, 97, points out that Ritterling's suggestion would allow Frontinus barely a year's tenure of his German command, and that although he might more plausibly have held it between 78 and 82, the hypothesis

of a legionary legateship in 71-2 affords an equally satisfactory explanation of the inscription. It is a little surprising, it must be admitted, to find this inscription at Vetera, for the II *Ind Adj.* was quartered elsewhere at Batavodurum late in 70 A.D. (Tac. *Hist.* V. 20). But the difficulty is hardly serious.

³ Ritterling, *P.-W. s.v. Legio*, cols. 1652 and 1694.

The remaining two legions, II *Adj.* and XIII *Gem.*, had presumably formed a part of the army which marched from Italy by way of the west-Alpine passes (*Hist.* IV. 68) and joined Cerialis at Trèves after the battle on the Moselle. They must inevitably have passed straight through the territory of the Lingones on their road from Lyon to Trèves. It was then their action which finally quelled the revolt among the Lingones and enabled Cerialis to concentrate his forces against the main body of insurgents on the lower Rhine.¹

The XIIIth was a Pannonian legion that had played a prominent part in the fighting against Vitellius. Its commander at the outset was Vedius Aquila (*Hist.* II. 44 with III. 7). And as he had neither been killed nor fallen victim to political jobbery, of either of which events Tacitus would certainly have informed us, there is a presumption that he was still in command. There were too many new military appointments required at this juncture to permit of the replacement of sympathetic and able commanders. The IInd legion, on the other hand, was a new formation.² A new and efficient *legatus* was clearly needed to launch it on its career as a *justa legio*. What more natural than the appointment of Frontinus, of whose efficiency subsequent events leave no doubt, who had moreover recently resigned an urban magistracy in favour of the new imperial family?

II *Adj.* did not long remain in Germany. The revolt of Civilis crushed, Cerialis departed to assume the governorship of Britain; and with him he took this legion to replace XIV, which was henceforth to be stationed in Upper Germany. If it was as commander of the former that Frontinus received the submission of the Lingones, he must still have been in command during some at least of Cerialis' northern fighting. In that case he too was experienced in British problems when he was called upon to govern the province.

The point is of a little more than parochial importance. The Flavian governors of Britain are seen to provide a striking example of a tendency that was already making itself felt in the most diverse branches of administration. The old republican system had made no provision for the specialist. The very idea was repulsive. And very naturally; for in one aspect at least the downfall of the republic may be regarded as the triumphant vindication of this point of view. Under the Empire the situation was very different. The old system by which it was demanded that every man should be able to do everything gradually gave place to an ever increasing specialization. Prejudice does not die in a night. Under the Flavians the senatorial provinces were in normal times still governed by the old methods. But in the imperial sphere we can begin to trace a definite breakaway from the old ideas. Cases of specialization outside Britain are not hard to find. During the troubled period on the Danube under Domitian we find Funisulanus Vettonianus successively governor of Dalmatia, of Pannonia and of Moesia Superior.³ His career is perhaps open to the suspicion of political rather than administrative expediency, but this cannot be said of the next instance. When some disturbance in Mauretania

¹ This reconstruction of events has the interesting corollary that it suggests the control, nominal, if not actual, of the two legions II and XIII by the young Domitian, who advanced by the same route as far as Lyon (*Hist.* IV. 86) and may well have had the command of this force until its junction with Cerialis at Trèves (cf. the words of Frontinus, *auspiciis Domitiani*). In view of the alleged treasonable overtures of Domitian to Cerialis (Tac. loc. cit.) the point is of some importance. I owe this suggestion to Mr. R. Syme, to whom, as also to Mr. C. W. M. Cox, I am much indebted for advice and criticism in the preparation of this note.

² Ritterling's hypothesis (P.-W., s.v. *Legio*, cols. 1438-9) that it was formed from the sailors of the Ravennate fleet who had deserted to Vespasian early in the civil war (*Hist.* III. 36, 40) is surely on all grounds more acceptable than that of Mommsen who believed them to be a reconstitution of the Vitellian 'e classicis legio' (*Hist.* III. 57). The question is here immaterial, for in either case a fresh *legatus* was an obvious necessity.

³ *CIL*, III. 4013, XI. 571; Dess. 1005. He had previously served as *trib. mil.* in VI *Victrix* and had commanded IV under Caesennius Paetus in Armenia.

demanded the appointment of a single *legatus pr. pr. utriusque Mauretaniae* in place of the usual two procurators, the choice fell on Sex. Sentius Caecilianus, who from his experience as a Vespasianic boundary commissioner in Africa with Rutilius Gallicus and later as *legatus* of the IIIrd legion might be relied upon to be well acquainted with African affairs.¹ These two examples must here suffice. But they do not stand alone in illustrating this tendency of the Flavian emperors to appoint men to posts for which their previous careers had especially fitted them. The resulting increase in administrative efficiency needs no stressing. It may well be to this fact that the advance in N. Britain owed much of the success which it certainly achieved.

J. B. WARD PERKINS.

¹ Dess. 8969 and 5955; *CIL*. IX. 4194; Cagnat, *L'Armée romaine d'Afrique* p. 287; C.R. Acad. Inscr. 1894 p. 46.

METRICAL OBSERVATIONS ON AESCH. *PERS.*

922-1001.

TEXT, interpretation and metre present a tangled problem in this threnody, and the solutions of editors differ widely. The chief function of detailed metrical study in such corrupt passages of lyric is to weight the scales in favour of—or more often against—certain methods of handling the text. The positive results of this present attempt to apply metrical criteria are necessarily modest and tentative; negatively they are, I think, sometimes decisive.

The version of the text given is that which seems best supported by metrical considerations. The critical notes are confined to readings directly discussed in the commentary.

TEXT.

Xo. γὰ δ' αἰάζει τὰν ἐγγαίαν	922	----	----
ἦβαν Ξέρξῃ κταμέναν "Αἰδον			
σάκτορι Περσᾶν· ῥοδοβάται γὰρ		----	----
πολλοὶ φῶτες, χώρας ἄνθος,			
τοξοδάμαντες, πᾶν ταρφύς τις			
μυριάς ἀνδρῶν, ἐξέφθινται.			
Ξε. αἰαὶ αἰαὶ κεδνᾶς ἀλκᾶς.	928	----	----
Xo. Ἀσία δὲ χθῶν † βασιλεῦ γαίας†			
αἰνῶς αἰνῶς ἐπὶ γόνυ κέκλιται.		----	uuuuuu

928 choro continuat Meineke.

Wil. αἰαὶ <βασιλεῦ> κεδ. ἀλκ. deleto βασ. γαι. 929.

fort. αἰαὶ <γαίας> κεδνᾶς ἀλκᾶς.

Ἀσία δὲ χθῶν [βασιλεῦ γαίας].

Ξε. ὄδ' ἐγών, οἰοί, αἰακτὸς	932	paroemiac
μέλεος γέννα γῆ τε πατρώα		anap. dim.
κακὸν ἄρ' ἐγενόμαν.		doch.
Xo. πρόσφθογγόν <νύν> σοι νόστου		
[τὰν]		paroem.
κακοφάτιδα βοᾶν κακομέλετον ἰὰν		2 doch.
Μαριανδυνοῦ θρηνητήρος		anap. dim.
πέμψω πέμψω πολύδακρυν ἰαχάν.		2 doch.

935 νύν conieci deleto post Wil. τάν.

Wil. 935 πέμψω πρόσφθογγόν σοι νόστου anap. dim.

938 πέμψω πολύδακρυν ἰαχάν. paroem.

Ξε. ἔτ' αἰανῇ [καὶ] πάνδυρτον	939	
δυσθροον αὐδάν. δαίμων γὰρ ὄδ' αὐ		
μετάτροπος ἐπ' ἔμοί.		
Xo. ἦσω τοι καὶ πάνδυρτον	943	
λαοπαθία σέβων ἀλίτυπά τε βάρη		
πόλεως γέννας πενθητήρος		
κλάγξω <--> u u ἀρίδακρυν.		

944 λαοπαθία Wecklein σέβων Elmsley λαοπαθῇ τε σεβίζων codd.

948 κλ. δ' αὐ (δὲ Blaydes) γόνυ ἄρ. codd. <κλάγξω> δ' ἀρίδακρυν ἰαχάν Hermann.

Wil. 943 ἦσω τοι <σοι> καὶ πάνδυστον
 σὰ πάθη τε σέβων ἀλίτυπά τε
 βάρη
 πόλεως γέννας, πενθητήρος
 κλάγξω δ' αὖ γόνον ἀρίδακρυν.

anap. dim.
 anap. dim.
 anap. dim.
 paroem.

Ξε. Ἰάνων γὰρ ἀπηύρα,
 Ἰάνων ναύφρακτος Ἄρης ἑτεραλκῆς,
 νυχίαν πλάκα κερσάμενος δυσδαί-
 μονά τ' ἄκταν.
 Χο. οἰοιοῖ [βόα] καὶ πάντ' ἐκπεύθου.—
 ποῦ δὲ φίλων ἄλλος ὄχλος
 ποῦ δέ σοι παραστάται
 οἷος ἦν Φαρανδάκης
 Σούσας Πελάγων
 Σουσιस्कάνης τ'
 Ἀγβάτανα λιπών;

949 ion. dim.
 ion. trim.
 anap. trim. cat.
 955 ≡----- paroem.
 chor. dim.
 lecyth.
 " anap. dim.
 960 " doch.

955 choro tribuit Lachmann, Xerxi codd. βόα deleui fort. οἰοῖ vel ὅτοτοῖ.
 Wil. Χο. οἰοιοῖ. Ξε. βόα καὶ πάντ' ἐκπεύθου.
 961 ἀγαβάτανα Weil.

Ξε. ὅλοος ἀπέλειπον
 Τυρίας ἐκ ναὸς ἔρροντας ἐπ' ἄκραις
 Σαλαμινίαισι στυφελοῦ θείοντας ἐπ'
 ἄκτας.
 Χο. οἰοιοῖ ποῦ [δὲ] σοι Φαρνούχος
 Ἀριόμαρδος τ' ἀγαθός,
 κτλ.
 τᾶδε σ' ἐπανερόμαν.

962
 967
 973

967 οἰοιοῖ <βόα> deletο δὲ Hermann. 968 κ' ἀριόμαρδοστ' M. κ, del. Brunck.

Ξε. ἰὼ ἰὼ μοι τὰς ὠγυγίους κατιδόντες
 στυγνὰς Ἀθῆνας πάντες ἐνὶ πιτύλῳ
 ἐὴ ἐλ τλάμονες ἀσπαίρουσι χέρσῳ
 Χο. ἦ καὶ κτλ.
 ἔλιπες ἔλιπες; ὦ ὦ δάμων
 Πέρσαις ἀγανοῖς κακὰ πρόκακα λέγεις.

974 υ-υ-- + paroem.
 --υ-- + doch.
 υ-υ-- + ionic dim.
 978
 985 υυυυυυ- ----
 --υ-- υυυυυυ-

974 μοί μοί M Wil. κατιδόντες <τὰς> post Blomfield Mazon.

Ξε. ἔγγα μοι δῆτ' ἀγαθῶν ἐτάρων <ἀνα-
 κινεῖς>
 <ἄλαστ'> ἄλαστα στυγνὰ πρόκακα
 λέγων.
 βοῶ βοῶ <μοι> μελέων ἐνδοθεν ἦτορ.
 Χο. καὶ μὴν κτλ.
 ἔταφον ἔταφον οὐκ ἀμφὶ σκηναῖς
 τροχηλάτουσιν ὅπιθεν ἐπομένους.

988
 1000
 υ-υ-υ υυυυυυ-

988 δῆτα Schroeder 989 ἀνακινεῖς conieci ὑπομνήσκευς codd. ὑπορίνευς Hermann.
 990 ἄλαστ' add. Hermann. 991 ἐντοσθεν post Blomf. edd.
 Wil. <ἰὼ ἰὼ> δῆτα,
 ἔγγ' ἀγαθῶν ἐτάρων μοι
 <κινεῖς> ἄλαστα κτλ.

ERS.

renody, and
 etrical study
 r more often
 this present
 ; negatively

by metrical
 ussed in the

Hermann.

COMMENTARY.

928-9. Hardly enough ground, perhaps, for introducing conjectures into the text, but βασιλεὺ γαίης is certainly suspicious after Ἀσία δὲ χθών, and some of Σ make an effort to connect γαίης with ἐπὶ γόνυ κέκλιται. Wil.'s emendation is perhaps undesirable on formal grounds in that (1) it breaks the triadic recurrence of spondaic lines to which Schroeder calls attention (but this is not of much significance), (2) the parallel with 918 ὅτοιοι βασιλεὺ στρατιῶς ἀγαθῆς, in an anapaestic series of different type, is hardly probable. I would suggest that αἰαὶ γαίης would easily account for the codd., given the predilection for filling in missing monometers in anapaests, and would give a rather better sense to κεδνῶς ἄλλκῶς. Is there any urgent reason for following Meineke as all edd. do in taking 928 from Xerxes? 932 is not his introductory utterance in any case; he has spoken 909-17. (Wil.'s punctuation after αἰακτὸς thus seems mistaken.) Wil. and Schroeder call attention to the 'separation of the last triad' by hiatus after 927, and Wil. suggests that it was spoken by the coryphaeus. The hiatus could more naturally be attributed to Xerxes' intervention; but as a matter of fact the exclamation itself is quite sufficient excuse, cf. 932.

The omission of a monometer is not in itself objectionable; Schroeder's three equal triads with a paraceleusmatic in the close instead of catalexis is only one possible account of the metrical pattern. It might equally well end in a penultimate monometer + clausula of two dochmiacs. The alternative interpretations of the last line can in the nature of things never advance beyond formal analysis; the line in any case falls into two halves and the sequence of syllables is undoubted; whether a difference would be perceptible in actual elocution we shall never know with certainty. Even the test of analogy fails, since these anapaests are in a class by themselves, more regular than 'Klaganapäste' yet with the α of song instead of the recitative η. It can only be a tentative suggestion that on general grounds an alien clausula is less startling than an anapaest of the form 000000- among such well-disciplined fellows; that in fact the nearest parallel would be Sophocles' ithyphallic close to an anapaestic series *El.* 200. Whether ---- should be regarded as actually a form of dochmiac or as a 'dochmiac equivalent' is again little more than a matter of terminology; 1075-6 show the same foot in dochmiac society again. The iambic penthemimer x-0-0- 975 and 986 raises the same question.

In the following threnody however there are stronger reasons for interpreting 000000- as a dochmiac throughout. It can scarcely be anything else (given the context) 987=1001 κακὰ πρόκακα λέγεις and ὄπιθεν ἐπομένους, and in 976 πάντες ἐνὶ πτερόνῳ it removes all doubt by lengthening the first *anceps*. As freedom of responsion in such lengthening is a prerogative of dochmiacs we are entitled to take the most obvious correction of λαοπαθῆ τε 945 and read λαοπαθέα without trying to explain λά- as an 'intensive prefix' or conjecturing some such word as νεοπαθέα. Wil. following Burney reads σὰ πάθη τε, making the line an anapaestic dimeter. Coupled with such a phrase as ἀλίτυπά τε βάρη and in responsion with κακοφάτιδα βοᾶν κακομέλετον ἰάν in a θρήνος so formally elaborate, this is a heavy lapse into stylistic and metrical bathos. A dochmiac clausula at 934 and 973 is again more easily assumed than an anapaestic monometer. Ἀγβάτανα λιπών 961 is a more dubious case. Weil's suggestion (prompted by Ἀγαβάτας 959) is untempting, and it might be better to explain -00000- as a resolution of the dochmiac form ----, the proper name being sufficient excuse for the license of responsion. Certainly at the close of the play it would be difficult to explain τρισκάλμοισιν 1075 as anything else, given the following βάρισιν ὀλομένα, which cannot be anapaestic. 984=999 thus also falls into place as a clausula of 2 doch. dims. 000000- ----|0-0-x 000000-.

More important is the problem of 938=948. It happens that the prosody of

both πολυ-
paroemi-
in a much
strophe or
point, not
happens t
sides. π
sense and
a suspici
paroemi-
freest 'K
-00000-
comprised
almost inc
πέμψω πολ
(1) δ' αὖτ
to πενθητή
break out
odd phras
point was
clever met
would ha
claimed).
ἐκπέυθον γ
are Byza
x-00000-
manner.

Eme
palaeogra
δὲ γόνυ ἀρ
the most
δὲ and δ'
metrical c
middle of
δύσθροον
picking u

Wila
πέμψω lef
lectic dir
diaeresis
rejecting
lum in ca
a procliti
only in re
Heph. 15,
a colon is
Blomfield

¹ e.g. Eu
The one e
πέμψατε δα
I suspect w
In any ca
wholly dac

both *πολύδακρυν* and *ἰαχάν* is ambiguous, and the great majority of edd. give a paroemiac clausula, deleting one *πέμψω*. But in cases of faulty responsion, especially in a much-corrupted text, the sound method is surely to consider first whether either strophe or antistrophe is in itself unobjectionable and can be taken as a fixed starting-point, not to force the good line into conformity with the weaker because emendation happens to look more straightforward that way, nor to make adjustments from both sides. *πέμψω πέμψω πολύδακρυν ἰαχάν* after the clausula 930 gives excellent style, sense and metre, and if it had not been for the antistrophe would never have roused a suspicion. *κλάγξω δ' αὖ γόον ἀρίδακρυν* --- --- on the other hand is a paroemiac of a shape nowhere else found among anapaests of any kind, even the freest 'Klaganapäste' subsequently elaborated by Euripides. The rare sequence --- --- is except in proper names confined to the opening of the line, i.e. is comprised within the same metron.¹ If Aesch. had used such a form here it is almost inconceivable that he should not at least have set it in strict responsion, but *πέμψω πολύδακρυν ἰαχάν* is as pedestrian a form as could be wished. Moreover (1) δ' αὖ is not easily explained so late in the sentence except by giving a forced sense to *πενθητήρος* and putting a stop after it. (2) The codd. in this context are liable to break out in conjectures apparently inspired by a desire to touch up the metre of odd phrases taken in isolation, such as 945 *λασπαθῇ τε σεβίζων* (clearly the starting-point was the contraction *λασπαθῇ*), 939 *ἴετ' αἰανῇ καὶ πανόδυρτον*. These are not clever metrical conjectures related to the context, such as the insertion of *πέμψω* 939 would have been (for that it arose by the accident of dittography will scarcely be claimed). The more pretentious metrical conjectures like οἱ οἱ λέγε καὶ πάντ' ἐκπεύθον 954 ποῦ δέ σοι φίλων δχλος 955 are found only in one or two manuscripts and are Byzantine work. (3) To return continually to the same closing formula (here --- ---) in successive stanzas in long lyrical odes is very much in Aesch.'s manner.

Emendation of the antistrophe is not easy. Hermann's conjecture is violent palaeographically and gives too close a parallel to the strophe. *κλάγξω <κλάγξω>* δὲ γόον ἀρίδακρυν leaves *πάνδυρτον* without a substantive expressed and thus cuts out the most natural interpretation of *γέννας πενθητήρος* = Mariandynian. Moreover both δὲ and δ' αὖ (if the latter be kept as a permissible dochmiac variant) are open to the metrical objection that alone in this whole threnody they break the diaeresis in the middle of anapaestic or dochmiac dimeters. It is possible that δ' αὖ γόον conceals *δυσθροον* (cf. 942) and that a disyllabic substantive has dropped out after *κλάγξω* picking up *πάνδυρτον* and the genitive *γέννας πενθητήρος*—some such word as *φωνάν*.

Wilamowitz, followed by Schroeder, complicates matters by transferring the *πέμψω* left on his hands to 935 and omitting *τάν*, thereby making this line an acatalectic dimeter. Apart from the violence of the procedure this gives a broken diaeresis and involves an awkward emendation of the blameless antistrophe. But in rejecting *τάν* he is surely right: as he says, 'foedum vitium admittebant qui articulum in catalexi tolerabant.' In the lyrics of tragedy the first syllable of a word, or a proclitic monosyllable, is tolerated at the end of a colon after a *long* penultimate² only in recognized synartete dicola (such as the Archilochian after Archilochus, v. *Heph.* 15, 88) and in metres of the 'dactylo-epitrite' type, where the last syllable of a colon is designed to be the link with the following colon. On the same grounds Blomfield's insertion of *<τάς>* at the end of 974 in order to save *ὑπομνησκεις* in

¹ e.g. Eur. *I.A.* 1322 *ὦφελεν ἔλταν πομπάιν*. The one exception appears to be Eur. *Hec.* 97 *πέμψατε δαίμονες ἱκετεύω*. Nauck deletes the line; I suspect wholesale interpolations in the context. In any case the fact that the first metron is wholly dactylic mitigates the abnormality here.

² A legitimate exception to this rule occurs where the lengthened penultimate is an irregular variation on a normal short, cf. Soph. *O.T.* 1196 (corresponding to a short), Ant. 1132 (a chor. dim. *rallentando*). The many other violations printed in our texts are due to faulty colometry).

the antistrophe should never have been adopted by modern editors. In 935 if a monosyllable such as *νυν* had dropped out *τάν* might have edged itself in from the line below, as a corrected variant on *ιάν*. Once *τάν* is away the balance of the sentence is restored and its interpretation easier; instead of *τάν κακοφάτιδα βοᾶν Μαρνανδυνοῦ θρηνητῆρος* (Wil. points out that the article is stylistically out of place here) with *πολύδακρυν ἰαχάν* in apposition, it is possible to take the genitive *νόστου* more closely with *κακοφάτιδα* and *κακομέλετον* and the whole phrase *πρόσφθογγον . . . ιάν* as predicative: 'Therefore to greet your ear, a cry of ill omen, a voice of ill boding for your return, will I send the Mariandynian mourner's weeping lament.'

Xerxes resumes 949 in ionic metre. 'Reiziana' are in the fashion now, but here I would suggest that (1) with such colometry the contraction *ναῦφρακτος* and shortened *syllaba anceps* in both strophe and antistrophe are suspicious; (2) the ionic trimeter is found in this form in hieratic song, Ar. *Ran.* 330 and cf. Anacr. *fr.* 51 (Bergk) *γαλαθηνόν, ὅστ' ἐν ὕλῃς κεροέσσης*; (3) trimetric construction of a studied and unusual form is characteristic of this context, cf. the next phrase, an anap. trim. cat., and in the next strophe again the trimetric combination of anapaestic and ionic elements.

955. Lachmann was the first to restore the correct assignment of speakers here, and in an ode of this formal regularity there can be no departure from strict correspondence. *ἐκπεύθου* is therefore self-exhortation of the Chorus, which then turns to Xerxes with the natural formula 'But where . . .?' If *ἐκπεύθου* were Xerxes' invitation, as Wil. takes it, *δέ* would be meaningless. In the confused double corruption of 955 = 967 perhaps the best starting-point is the antistrophe, where Hermann's excision [δ'] 967 and Brunck's [κ'] 968 are universally accepted. The most natural explanation of the *syllaba anceps* in *Φαρνούχῳ* is catalexis, i.e. the line is a paroemiac. If it is to be a complete anap. dim. as Wil. and Schroeder take it we must add τ' to keep synaphea. But the paroemiac is supported by (1) the preceding *σοι* and *καί* in 955, both of which would break the diaeresis in a complete dimeter; (2) the excellent parallel with the other paroemiac gambits of the context, 932 and 936 (preceding strophe) 978 (following strophe). It follows that *οἰοῖ* must either be shortened to *οἰοῖ* with F R Tricl. 955 or emended to *δοτοῖ* or pronounced with correption. It is possible that in 955 the corruption goes deeper, but the simplest expedient is to cut out *βῶα*, cf. *Sept.* 89 where *βοᾷ* has intruded into the text, apparently in place of an actual cry of dismay.¹ Wil. would have *βῶα* spoken as a single bark, which still does not explain how in his version nine long syllables are conceived to correspond with eight.

974-8 = 987-91. Wil. and Schroeder retain the double *μοι* of M, which causes difficulties in the antistrophe. Schroeder's hiatus after *δῆτα* has no particular metrical or rhetorical support, while Wil.'s disturbance of the text goes unnecessarily far and it is hard to believe that his paroemiac *ἔγγ' ἀγαθῶν ἐτάρων μοι* would have satisfied Aesch.'s ear. A reconstruction in Hermann's sense is the most natural (for my suggestion *ἀνακινεῖς* cf. Soph. *Tr.* 1259. I take *ὑπομνησκεις* to be a gloss on the whole phrase *ἀνακ. ἔγγα*). With Dindorf's generally accepted <μοι> 991 this gives a series of three cola founded on the iambic penthemimer *υ - υ - υ*, a phrase which sometimes appears among dochmiac variants (as here 976 and 986) and more often as a constituent part of cola where it is detachable only by formal analysis: so here 977 = 990, a line essentially similar to *P.V.* 128 and 133. Anacreontics pass over easily into regular ionic dims. or *υ υ - - - υ - -* (cf. *P.V.* 400 and 406), and it is just possible that we may keep *ἐνδοθεν* here as a license of responsion such as occurs *P.V.* 400 = 408 (the text is quite sound) and several times in the hymn Ar. *Ran.* 323-50.

A. M. DALE.

LADY MARGARET HALL, OXFORD.

¹ It is tempting in *Pers.* 955 to imagine a disyllable imperative = 'Cry of.'

THE

IN t
tion has
Rom
milia civi
ingera et
describe

No
been ma
Niebuhr
cautiousl
and Mr
present v
passage
Vitellia.
means V
already a
29. 3. cf.
Suet., loc
colonists
to by Liv
long way
refer to V

(a) ?

(b) v

The

the year
informati
who assign
Diodorus
discrepan
tresviri co
office. I
ably more
their offic
Circeii: i
some oth
perverse
the consu
office the
is true th

¹ B. G. M
is followe
p. 311, n. 6
E. Pais, *St*
² G. De

n. 4.

³ H. M. I

⁴ C. P. I

Geschichte R

⁵ Livy vi

THE LATIN COLONIES AT VITELLIA AND CIRCEII.

In the fifth book of Livy there is a passage of which hitherto no good explanation has been forthcoming:

Romae interim multiplex seditio erat, cuius leniendae causa coloniam in Volscos, quo tria milia civium Romanorum scriberentur, deducendam censuerant; triumvirique ad id creati terna iugera et septunces viritum diviserant (Livy v, 24. 4: 395 B.C.). (Livy then goes on to describe the viritane division of the *ager Veientanus*.)

No satisfactory identification of the colony here alluded to by Livy has ever been made, scholars being for the most part content to accept the suggestion of Niebuhr that Vitellia must be meant.¹ Yet Professor De Sanctis has somewhat cautiously pointed out that it is uncertain whether this passage does refer to Vitellia,² and Mr Last more boldly remarks that 395 is not a suitable date for Vitellia.³ The present writer is prepared to go still further and assert quite categorically that this passage from Livy cannot refer to Vitellia. We know exceedingly little about Vitellia. The suggestion that, when Livy mentions it, he is confused and really means Velitrae⁴ may be summarily rejected. What we know is that Vitellia was already a colony in 393 when it was attacked and destroyed by the Aequi (Livy v, 29. 3, cf. too Suet., *Vit.* 1). This colony was in *Aequis* (Livy, *loc. cit.* and ii, 39. 4; Suet., *loc. cit.*) and presumably not a very great distance from Rome, whither the colonists escaped when the Aequi razed their city. Yet the colony of 395, referred to by Livy in the above quoted passage, was in *Volscis* and quite evidently a fairly long way from Rome. The conclusion is irresistible that Livy v, 24. 4 does not refer to Vitellia. As a consequence we are faced with two problems:

(a) To what colony is Livy referring?

(b) When was Vitellia colonized if not in 395?

The answer to the first question is not really difficult to find. Livy's notice for the year 395 must refer to Circeii. It has always been thought that our only information concerning Circeii's colonization is to be found in Diodorus (xiv, 102. 4), who assigns it to the Varronian year 393.⁵ The discrepancy between Livy's 395 and Diodorus' 393 can be easily explained (if indeed explanation is needed for so small a discrepancy in the period before the Gallic raid): Livy is giving the year when the *tresviri coloniae deducendae* were appointed, Diodorus the year when they vacated their office. It was not uncommon for colony commissioners to be in office for considerably more than a year; the colony of course dated from the year when they vacated their office.⁶ The present writer sees no good reason for rejecting this early date for Circeii: it is desperate to argue that so early a date could have reference only to some other (and otherwise completely unknown) Circeii near Velitrae,⁷ and it is perverse to suggest that, as Circeii was founded during the consulship of a Sulpicius, the consul of 361 rather than the consul of 393 was the one during whose tenure of office the event took place.⁸ The archaeological evidence seems to support 393.⁹ It is true that a hurried reading of Livy might suggest that the colony mentioned in

¹ B. G. Niebuhr, *Röm. Gesch.*, ii, p. 550, who is followed by T. Mommsen, *Röm. Munzw.*, p. 311, n. 63, E. Kornemann in P.-W s.v. *Coloniae*, E. Pais, *Stor. Crit. di Roma*, ii, pp. 4-8.

² G. De Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani*, ii, p. 152, n. 4.

³ H. M. Last in *Camb. Anc. Hist.*, vii, p. 510.

⁴ C. P. Burger, *Sechzig Jahre aus der älteren Geschichte Roms*, p. 115.

⁵ Livy vi, 13. 8 makes it clear that Circeii was

colonized before 385.

⁶ T. Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsr.*, ii³, p. 638.

⁷ J. Clason, *Röm. Gesch.*, ii, p. 214.

⁸ J. Beloch, *Röm. Gesch. bis zum Beginn der pun. Kriege*, p. 359.

⁹ G. Lugli, *Forma Italiae*, Regio 1, vol. 1, part 2, pp. v, 2, 3 (cf. T. Ashby in *Mélanges d'Arch. et d'Hist. de l'Ecole Franc. de Rome*, xxv, 1905, pp. 158-209).

395 was of the citizen type, whereas we know that Circeii was a Latin colony (Livy xxvii, 9; xxix, 15). But actually the colony of 395 could not have been citizen for two reasons: first, the number of the colonists was 3,000 (whereas prior to 183 B.C. citizen colonies regularly received only 300 colonists), and secondly, the conception of a citizen colony was still unknown in 395; it was not until late in the fourth century that the first citizen colony was despatched, probably to Antium in 338. In fact Livy's language about the colony of 395 is no more remarkable than the language he uses of many of the Latin colonies of this early period (see v, 29. 3; vi, 22. 4; vii, 42. 8; viii, 3. 9 where he actually calls Circeii a *colonia Romana*).

If we are right in thinking that Livy v, 24. 4 refers to Circeii we now can supplement the details that Diodorus gives concerning that town's colonization. We get confirmation of the date (first decade of the fourth century B.C.) and we learn in addition that the number of colonists settled was 3,000, each of whom received $3\frac{1}{3}$ iugera.

The answer to our second problem, when was Vitellia colonized? cannot indeed be certainly given; we can however arrive at the approximate date. We have already remarked that very little is known about Vitellia. Its very site is a matter for speculation. However, as it was in *Aequis*, it must have lain somewhere between the Algidus pass and the territory of the Hernici. The present writer ventures the suggestion that it was on the same site as the modern village of Valmontone. Any visitors to this site will agree that it is of the type which in early Latium would have had a town on it, and modern investigators have not been able to decide which of the 'lost and mislaid cities of Latium' it was.¹ A colony placed here, owing to its control of important roads,² would be admirably placed to perform the task expected of any colony situated in *Aequis*, viz. protect what was the big bone of contention between Romans and Aequi, the pass of Algidus. It was the normal procedure of the Romans, when once they had made an advance, to send colonies to protect those points which previous experience had shown to be vulnerable. In the fifth century the Aequi penetrated as far as Algidus, i.e. to the rim of the Alban hills. When the Romans ejected the Aequi thence, traditionally in 431,³ we should expect to find them sending out a colony to block the path which previous experience had shown the Aequi would use in any renewed attempt to advance to Algidus. And in actual fact we do find notices of colonization proposals in the years immediately following 420. Vitellia indeed is not mentioned in any of these notices. The ancient sources mention Bola and Labici. But, despite Mr Last,⁴ Bola was never colonized (see Livy iv, 49). As for Labici, a town situated near Algidus and the modern villages of Monte Compatri and Colonna,⁵ Livy indeed says that it was a colony (iv, 47, 49), but his assertion has long been suspect. Most students of the subject have been content to follow Mommsen and remove Labici from the list of colonies.⁶ As a matter of fact Mommsen's reasons for rejecting the notices of Labici's colonization are inadequate,⁷ although his conclusion, that Labici was never colonized, is sound

¹ G. Bagnani, *Roman Campagna and its Treasures*, p. 163.

² See T. Ashby, *Roman Campagna in Classical Times*, p. 152.

³ See H. M. Last in *Camb. Anc. Hist.*, vii, pp. 502 f.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 469.

⁵ G. Tomassetti, *Diss. della Pont. Accad. Rom. di Arch.*, Ser. ii, viii, 1903, pp. 45 f.; T. Ashby, *Rom. Camp.*, p. 150; G. Bagnani, *op. cit.*, p. 128; G. De Sanctis, *op. cit.*, ii, p. 119.

⁶ T. Mommsen, *Röm. Gesch.*, i, p. 349; A. Stephenson, *Public Lands and Agrarian Laws in the Roman Republic* (Baltimore, 1891), p. 23; E.

De Ruggiero, s.v. *colonia* in *Dict. Epigr.*; E. Kornemann, *loc. cit.*; G. De Sanctis, *op. cit.*, ii, p. 431; J. Beloch, *op. cit.*, p. 157.

⁷ Mommsen adduces the silence of Diodorus (which is inconclusive), Livy's description of Labici as a *colonia Romana* (Livy applies this phrase to many of the pre-338 colonies), Cicero's statement that Labici was a *municipium* (after the Social War all the Latin colonies that so desired became such), the fact that Labici was on originally Latin territory whither Latin colonies were never sent (yet Ardea, also on territory originally Latin, undoubtedly received a colony).

enough
before 3
338—bu
(Livy ii
Dion. H
of these
after 33
was des
sine suff
It is abo
that we
that it n
418; th
represen
there is
up *viriti*
tradition
period i
surely i
would h
certainl

To

(a)

(b)

McM

1 Ostia
before 3
colony b
is also a
Cora an
Aurunci
confused
and acco

enough for the following reason. We know of several places which in the period before 338 are described as colonies—naturally Latin, as were all colonies prior to 338—but which nevertheless were not Latin colonies after 338, viz. Antium (Livy iii, 1. 5; Dion. Hal., ix, 59, 60), Vitellia (*loc. cit.*), Velitrae (Livy ii, 31; Dion. Hal., vi, 42, 43), Satricum (Livy vi, 16) and Labici.¹ Yet in the case of each of these places, except Labici, we learn how and why it ceased to be a Latin colony after 338. Antium was changed into a citizen colony in 338 (Livy viii, 14). Vitellia was destroyed by the Aequi in 393 (Livy v, 29. 3). Velitrae became a *municipium sine suffragio* in 338 (Livy viii, 14).² Satricum was destroyed in 346 (Livy vii, 27. 6). It is about Labici alone that the tradition is silent; and it seems reasonable to infer that we are never told how it came to lose its colonial status for the simple reason that it never had that status to lose. It is true that the *ager Labicanus* was taken in 418; the good authority of Diodorus (xiii, 6. 8), who, in the opinion of the writer, represents an older and more trustworthy tradition than Livy, vouches for that. But there is no need to assume that a colony was settled on it. It may have been divided up *viritim*, as Mommsen suggested.³ At the same time, as we have remarked above, tradition was insistent that a colony was sent into the Aequian neighbourhood in the period immediately after 420. If it was not sent either to Bola or to Labici, then surely it must have been sent to Vitellia, which, if we have correctly placed its site, would have admirably fulfilled its task of protecting the Algidus pass and which certainly was a colony a few years later in 393 at the time of its destruction.

To sum up, our investigation leads us to conclude—

(a) That Livy v, 24. 4 refers to Circeii, and

(b) That Vitellia (? modern Valmontone) was colonized *ca.* 420-415.

E. T. SALMON.

McMASTER UNIVERSITY, HAMILTON,
ONTARIO.

¹ Ostia also is said to have been a colony before 338, but excavation has revealed that the colony belongs to the late fourth century. There is also a notice in Livy ii, 16 of Latin colonies at Cora and Suessa Pometia, but mention of the Aurunci in the passage shows that Livy has confused Suessa Pometia with Suessa Aurunca and accordingly his notice is to be rejected.

² When Livy viii, 14. 7 says that *coloni* were sent to Velitrae in 338 he is talking loosely. He expressly tells us (viii, 20. 9) that in 338 Velitrae had received the same treatment as Privernum suffered in 329, i.e. the land of local senators was confiscated and given to Roman settlers, but there was no formal colonization.

³ *Röm. Gesch.*, i, p. 349.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

LITERATURE AND GENERAL.

American Journal of Philology. LVII. 3. July, 1936.

R. J. Getty: *Peneitalia and Penetrabilia in Post-Classical Latin*. Holds that the shorter form has the better authority. A. F. Braunlich: *To the Right in Homer and Attic Greek*. Seeks to show that ἐπὶ δεξιὰ means 'counterclockwise.' E. Fiesel: *X Represents a Sibilant in Early Etruscan*. Collects epigraphic evidence to support the statement in the title. A. M. Sturtevant: *Gothic Miscellanies*. Eleven notes, chiefly concerned with nouns and verbs. L. Edelstein: *The Philosophical System of Posidonius*. Describes the system at length, and attempts an appreciation of it. V. Scramuzza: *Were the Venerii in Sicily Serfs?* Argues that Verres' recognition of the serf-status of these men (by their employment as tithe contractors) was part of a general liberalizing movement then in progress in Italy. T. B. Jones: *The Source of Suidas for his Comments on the Legions known as the Joviani and the Herculiani*. Holds that the source was not Eunapius but Sozomen. B. Einarson: *Emendation of Aristotle Sophistici Elenchi 182b20*. Reads οἰωμένον for ὠνομένον and εὐαρχος for Εὐαρχος. T. Frank: *Two Notes*: on Hor. Od. III. 23. 17 suggests that *immunis* means 'spotless' by derivation; on Verg. Aen. II. 646 supports the poet's Epicureanism by reference to the line of Maecenas *Nec tumulum curo* etc.

LVII. 4. October, 1936.

H. T. Wade-Grey and B. D. Meritt: *Pylos and the Assessment of Tribute*. Maintains that the decree of 425 B.C. was the immediate result of the double victory of Pylos and Sphacteria. W. A. Laidlaw: *The Demonstrative Pronouns in the Plays of Terence*. Seeks to show that a short vowel cannot act as *brevis breuians* before a pronoun that is emphatic in the meaning of the sentence. U. Kahrstedt: *Chalcidic Studies*. Deals with Athenian attempts to prevent the unification of Chalcidice, and her subsequent dealings with the established state. H. Cherniss: *The Philosophical Economy of the Theory of Ideas*. Seeks to show how Plato proved that the theory was essential to his system in all its aspects. H. V. Canter: *Irony in the Orations of Cicero*. Considers the various forms of irony as a 'figure of thought,' and discusses its use in the separate sections of a speech, as well as in the different types of oratory. H. C. Youtie and O. M. Pearl: *Notes on P. Jand. VII. 141*. Identifies the text as part of a tax roll compiled at Karanis late in the second century A.D., and discusses the difficulties of the system of reckoning. T. Frank: *The Topography of Terence Adelphoe 573-85*. Relates the description to Rome instead of Athens.

Classical Philology. XXXI. 4. October, 1936.

Ch. Vellay, *Homère contre Hissarlik*: summarizes the discrepancies between the Homeric description of Troy and the Hissarlik site. G. D. Hadzsits, *The Vera Historia of the Palatine Ficus Ruminalis*: the sacred fig-tree was originally named from the primitive deity Rumina; when this origin had been forgotten and the legend of Romulus had been developed, its name was changed to *Romularia*; in the first century B.C. the old name was revived. P. R. Coleman-Norton, *Philosophical Aspects of Roman Drama*: from references to philosophy and philosophical doctrines concludes that the average spectator had some superficial acquaintance with Greek philosophies even before they were cultivated at Rome. Irving Barkan, *Imprisonment as a Penalty in Ancient Athens*: argues from statements in the orators that imprisonment was used as a substantive penalty. J. A. O. Larsen, *The Treaty of Peace at the Conclusion of the Second Macedonian War*: the terms of the peace are not given in Polyb. 18. 14 and

Livy 33
conditio
Romans
Livy 32
1. 3. 1
1. 11. 2
<vitia>
2. 7. 1
Rustica:
their da
N. Italy
planatic
months

XX

A.
evidenc
J. A. O.
(i) the
with Ro
tion of
Athens
Nicanor
accepte
Stukee
but sup
Harsh,
street;
be use
(c.P. 30
formul
G. E. I
57-58,
Euripid
and so
rebel:
presum
Antholo
other M
Camb.
lost):
Salmon
sources
G. W.
dropp
the un
stitutin

Ne
W
römisch
examin
'Princ

Livy 33. 30, which are concerned with details of its application and some additional conditions, and must be reconstructed from the account of the demands made by the Romans and their allies at the conference at Nicaea in Polyb. 18. 1-2 and Livy 32. 33. W. H. Alexander, *Some Disputed Passages in Seneca's De Clementia*: 1. 3. 1 *prima erit <hu>manae missionis*; 1. 3. 5 *voluntariam <in mortem> subsiluius*; 1. 11. 2 (*et hum. gen. comprehendit te sibi <temperantissimum ti>mor*); 1. 26. 1 *nequitia <vitia> adparat*; 2. 2. 3 *ingenia immania, et inuisa in materia fecundiora, expresserunt*; 2. 7. 1 *veniam tuam (vacuam codd.) constituamus*. Annie L. Broughton, *The Menologia Rustica*: these calendars cannot be used as evidence for early Roman religion, since their dates show that they were made for a colder climate than Rome's, perhaps in N. Italy. The date of the Roman harvest (in June) invalidates the common explanation of the *October equus* rite as a harvest festival; it occurred not only four months after the harvest but actually after the sowing of the new crop.

XXXII. 1. January, 1937.

A. T. Olmstead, *Cuneiform Texts and Hellenistic Chronology*: tests the cuneiform evidence for Seleucid and Parthian chronology and discusses its use and limitations. J. A. O. Larsen, *The Peace of Phoenice and the Outbreak of the Second Macedonian War*: (i) the *adscripti* included in the treaty were not neutrals but states in official alliance with Rome; the insertion of Athens and Ilium is due to distortion; critical examination of the accounts of Livy and Paus. shows no evidence for relations between Athens and Rome before the war: (ii) the first ultimatum presented by Rome to Nicanor went beyond the terms of the Peace and could not have been honourably accepted by Philip; for whatever reason, Rome must have wanted war. H. J. Stukeley, *The Cyrenaean Hikesioi*: the *ἱκέσιοι* of the Cyr. ritual inscr. are not suppliants but supernatural *alastores* whose malign visitations avenge wrongdoing. P. W. Harsh, *Angiportum, Platea and Vicus*: *angiportum* is synonymous with *vicus*, an ordinary street; *platea* or *via*, when used in contrast, is a boulevard; but any of the words may be used generally. M. Parry, *About Winged Words*: argues against Calhoun (c.P. 30. 215) that *ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα* has no emotional value but is merely a formula for 'and he said' used to avoid clumsy repetition of the speaker's name. G. E. Duckworth, *The Verse Structure of Epidicus* 25-26: these ll., like 9-10, 29-30, 57-58, show a system of two cretics + twelve iambs. A. C. Schlesinger, *Two Notes on Euripides*: (i) in *Hec.* 116-40 Odysseus is right (on his premises) in advising sacrifice; and so are the sons of Theseus; in emphasizing their part Eur. is the patriot, not the rebel: (ii) this is confirmed by the order of the debate; E.'s practice creates a presumption that the second speaker has his sympathy. D. M. Schullian, *The Anthology of Valerius Maximus and A. Gellius*: to Valentini's Vat. Lat. 3307 adds two other MSS. of the collection of excerpts from V.M. and A.G.—Par. Lat. 4952 and Camb. Trin. Coll. R. 16. 34 (to be identified with the *Jacobaeus*, hitherto believed lost): all three are independent and have value for the tradition of V.M. E. T. Salmon, *Concerning the Second Sallustian Suasoria*: the vague reminiscences of Greek sources adduced by Post to support authenticity may be used to the opposite effect. G. W. Elderkin, *Sosus and Aristophanes*: Arist. fr. 305a and Athen. 10. 427e (food dropped from table belongs to the heroes, or the dead) suggest that Sosus' mosaic of the unswept dining-room floor (Plin. *N.H.* 36. 184) had a ritual symbolism, substituting imitation for real scraps.

Neue Jahrbücher für Wissenschaft und Jugendbildung. XII. 3. 1936.

W. Kunkel, *Über das römische Recht als geschichtliche Erscheinung und Ausdruck römischen Wesens*. A critical analysis of the development of Roman law and an examination of its strong and weak points, partly in connexion with F. Schulz's 'Principien des röm. Rechts.'

XII. 4. 1936.

P. Gohlke, *Aristoteles an Alexander über das Weltall*. An elaborate defence of the authenticity of the *de Mundo* as work of Aristotle's later period, reflecting the complicated state of his theories about 325 B.C.

XII. 5. 1936.

E. Kirsten, *Die Entstehung des spartanischen Staates* (with five illustrations of Laconian landscapes). An interpretation of the successive phases of Spartan history in the light of literary and archaeological evidence, with especial emphasis on the archaeological background.

XII. 6. 1936.

U. Knoche, *Horaz, der Klassiker der römischen Satire*. A lucid exposition of Horace's place in the succession of Roman satirists.

Philological Quarterly (Iowa). XIV. 4. (October, 1935.)

R. C. Flickinger reviews A. Gudeman's *Aristoteles Περὶ Ποιητικῆς*. J. W. Ashton reviews F. M. Padelford's edition of *The Axiochus of Plato translated by Edmund Spenser*.

XV. 1. (January, 1936.)

Gilbert Norwood argues that Euripides in the *Hippolytus* uses the myth of the Gift of Prayers to show that it is unworthy of acceptance.

XV. 2. (April, 1936.)

A. Woodward examines, from *Aeneid* II, the effect of clash and coincidence of accent and ictus in the fourth foot of the Virgilian hexameter.

Philologus. XC. 4 (N.F. Bd. XLIV. 4).

L. Weber, ΠΙΕΠΗ, ΠΗΠΕΗ. Defends ἐν Πιερύ against ἐν Πηρύ (near M. Othrys) at Hom. B. 766, thinking the latter an attempt at emendation by Alexandrians. P. Schnabel, *Die Weltkarte des Agrippa als wissenschaftliches Mittelglied zwischen Hipparch und Ptolemaeus*. I. The map more scientific than has been supposed. II. Hipp.'s map better than Eratosthenes' because based on pure maths. III. Pliny's account of 7th and 8th parallel (*N.H.* VI. 211) derived from Agrippa. IV. A's latitude of Italy based partly on itineraries, partly on pure maths. V. Certain meridian lines (which are corrections of Eratosth.), mentioned in Strabo and Ptol., go back to A. VI. Estimate of 1° lat. = 80 Roman miles is A's. A. corrects estimates of Hipp. The author prints a text with *app. crit.* of *Dem. Prov.* and *Div. Orb. Terr.* A. Gudeman, *Die Textüberlieferung der aristotelischen Poetik* (Schluss). III (f). Estimate of P² (= Bywaters' P²). (g). Valla's trans. was not entirely based on E. Perhaps Herm. Alemannus' MS was original of the Toledo trans. (T'). T' corresponds exactly with M' (the Eton trans.). The readings of T' and M' show that the text of the 11th-cent. MSS was as corrupt as the 14th and 16th. IV. Combats the 'apographa' hypothesis: the corrections of A are not conjectures, but from a MS source. F. Klingner, *Horazerkklärungen* (Schluss). 4. Takes traditional view of meaning of S. I. 6. 16. 5. An analysis of *Ep.* II. 2. U. Knoche, *Betrachtungen über Horazens Kunst der satirischen Gesprächsführung* (Schluss). Transitions in H. arise out of (1) subord. clauses, e.g. S. I. 2, II. 3, *Ep.* I. 1; (2) apposition, e.g. E. I. 19, II. 1. 231; (3) a single word, often not its most obvious sense, e.g. E. II. 2. 60, 140, S. I. 4. 42. *Suavitas* used by Cic. and Quint. of H.'s style means the 'flow'. W. Otto, *Zur Lebenszeit des P. Pomponius Secundus*. C. Cichorius put P. S.'s death in the late 60's A.D., the date based on Plin. *N.H.* XIII.

83; bu
probab
his bic
before
der TH
Says F
eviden
colloqu
B. Rel
Scaen.
W. Ri
M
IX. pr
of Sen

X
O.
Frag.
(1) An
θερμυδ-
problem
of A.'s
remark
vous pe
only ap
which
are use
T.t.'s a
where i
in time
punning
(not de
in a ser
Arist.
view th
but sho
author
parison
perhaps
Neuschö
(De Or.
(= the S
who pr
both his
Mi
A. v. B
ἐκίνησε
that 8-
theatre.

Pro
M.
(derived

83; but that passage is no evidence for the *exact* date. Pliny's *Bell. Germ.* was probably not finished till 57 (vid. Plin. *Epp.* III. 5), i.e. took about ten years. But his biography of P. S. begun after the *B.G.* must have been published some time before it—after 51 and before 57. P. S. died between these two dates. *Beiträge aus der Thesaurus-Arbeit* II. W. H. Friedrich defends *bustus* as a Middle Latin form. Says Petr. uses *epulae* in opposition to *bellum* (=pleasures of peace). G. Burckhardt: *equidem* in Cic. with 3rd pers. is colloquial, with 1st pers. literary; *ego quidem* is colloquial. L. Junod makes some remarks on *erumpo* and emends Apul. *Mund.* 23. B. Rehm detects a tragic fragment in Hier. *Vit. Paul.* F. Mehmel compares Enn. *Scaen.* 278 with Eur. *Med.* 526 ff. H. Haffter offers a new view of Plaut. *Mil.* 326-30. W. Richter: *madens* (of grapes) at Claud. I. 273 = 'ripe'.

MISZELLEN.—F. Walter, *Zu beiden Seneca.* Emendations of *Contr.* VII. 1. 21; IX. praef. 2; IX. 3. 11, 6. 20; X. 1. 9; IV. 3. 2; *Suas.* 2. 4, 15; 4. 1; 2. 10; and of *Sen. Ep.* 15. 11; 78. 28; 105. 3; 120. 20.

XCI. 1 (N.F. Bd. XLV. 1).

O. Gigon, *Zu Anaxagoras.* A's inconsistency about *πλῆθος* and *σμικρότης* in Frag. 59 B1 due to a fusion of (1) Ionic and (2) Eleatic teaching, borrowed from (1) Anaximander, (2) Zeno; e.g. A's *ἀνρ-αἰθῆρ* opposition developed from the *θερμὸν-ψυχρὸν* of Anaximander. Discusses Parmenides, Zeno and A. on the problems raised by τὸ συνεχές. Inadequacy of A. on τὸ κενόν. Examines the sources of A.'s theory of *homoeomeria*, and offers parallels from Zeno and Parm. for A.'s remarks on τὸ ἀπειρον, κίνησις, γένεσις καὶ φθορά, ἔντρα χρήματα; but A.'s theory of νοῦς peculiar to himself. W. Krieg, *Der trochäische Tetrameter bei Euripides.* T.t.'s only appear in the later plays, in increasing numbers in the latest (except *El.* and *Ba.*, which are archaistic in style). T.t.'s in stichomythia first found in *Hel.* and *I.T.*; are used for dialogue, to introduce a new character, for endings, for quick movement. T.t.'s are broken mostly after the diaeresis in 4th foot, but in latest plays almost anywhere in the line. They confirm the later dating of *Ion*, and disprove the separation in time of *Her.* and *Tro.* S. Josifović, *Zu Platons Symposion.* At 174B Plato is punning from Hesiod, the original form of the proverb being αὐτομάτοι ἀγαθοὶ ἀγαθῶν (not δειλῶν) ἐπὶ δαίτας ἵενται. E. Schlesinger, *Δαιμότης.* δεινὸς at *S. Ant.* 332 is used in a sense showing its development from *ungeheuer* to *fähig*. This illustrated from *Arist. Nic. Eth.* 1144b. A. Klotz, *Zu den Periochae des Livius.* Supports Niebuhr's view that the P. were made from Lists of Contents appended to each book of Livy, but shows that they also include insertions taken from (1) Livy's text, of which the author had more than we have, (2) from some *Exemplasammlung*, as is shown by comparison with Val. Max., Eutr., etc., and by details not in Livy himself. The P. perhaps 4th cent. K. Barwick, *Quintilians Stellung zu dem Problem sprachlicher Neuschöpfungen.* The sources of Q.'s examples of new words (8. 3. 30-37) are (1) Cic. (*De Or. et al.*), (2) an *epistula* of Messalla (cf. 1. 7. 35). In § 33 read *Sergio Plauto* (= the Stoic) and *ens*, not *queens*. In § 35 *Caecilius* = C. *Epirota* (cf. Suet. *De Gram.* 16), who probably wrote a commentary on Virgil, from which Q. got (through Messalla) both his remarks on Sisenna and on Hortensius.

MISZELLEN.—E. Wüst, *Διαστρέφειν bei Eupolis.* Means 'put on the rack'. A. v. Blumenthal, *Zur Kallimachos-Diegesis* III. 34. Read ἐπιπύνω for ἐπειπύνω and ἐκίνησε for ἐκίνηγς. C. Fensterbusch, *Zu Vitruv* V. 6, 8-9. Combats Bulle's view that 8. are out of place. V. is here describing the Roman, not the Greek, theatre.

Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy. XLII. Sect. C no. 10. (1935.)

M. Tierney, *The Parados in Aristophanes' Frogs*, objects to the current view (derived from the scholiasts) that the chorus here represents the initiates of the

Eleusinian Mysteries assembled in Hades. (1) There is no reference to Persephone and but a slight one to Demeter: (2) in the mysteries the proclamation (against murderers) was made *before* the start of the procession, which was held in the daytime; in the *Frogs*, not till the procession has started, the procession being held at night; and further in the Aristophanic proclamation there is nothing connected with Eleusis: (3) the procession to Eleusis had been suspended for some years past, and the Athenians would not have enjoyed a joke which reminded them of their own misfortunes: (4) We notice the use of the words *θίαρος* and *θιασῶται*, Dionysiac cult-terms, whereas there is no reason to think the Eleusinian initiates banded themselves in *θίαροι* at all. (5) The other-world punishments are not derived from Eleusinian but from Orphico-Dionysiac ideas. After a discussion of further difficulties raised by Tucker (*Frogs*, 1906) in reference to the Eleusinian hypothesis, T. by means of a detailed analysis of the Parodos and a commentary on certain of its ritual features seeks to establish the proposition that everything in it may be explained by reference to the Lenaea.

Revue de Philologie. LXI. 4. (October, 1935.)

R. Goossens, *Un nouveau fragment des Προσπάλτιοι d'Eupolis*, interprets the fragment (originally published by Norsa and Vitelli, *Bull. Soc. Arch. Alexandrie* 28 and *P.S.I.* XI) as belonging to one of the comedies staged in 430/29 and critical of Pericles' strategy. The natural identification with Eupolis' Προσπάλτιοι is possible, for other theories of that play's date and plot have no real basis; further, it is known to have contained an attack on Aspasia, which fits an early date. Bergk's conjecture that fr. 245 was spoken by the Euthyphro of Plato's dialogue is revived. M. G. Nicolau, *Notes sur la terminologie juridique latine: operis lex*, a technical term from public contracts, 'the specification', means in Horace *A.P.* 135 'the literary laws governing a subject's treatment.' In 'iudicium imperio continens' imperio is dative, as equally in the phrase *iudicia imperio continentur*; *contineo*, *contineor* = touch on. G. Ramain, *Horace: in Odes IV. 8* rejects line 17 as unmetrical and referring to the wrong Scipio, 16 as containing un-Horatian padding in the word *retrosum*, and then restores consecutive sense by reading *per quae spiritus et non celeris fugae | post mortem ducibus uita redit bonis, | eius* etc. At *Epod.* 16. 33 suggests *raucos* for *rauos*, which he regards as too archaic in the required sense; for it is the lion's roar not his colour that affrights the flocks. F. Préchac, *Sénèque et l'Histoire*; the gross historical errors of *de clementia* I. 9 are due to copyists; reads *iam <M. Antonium cum in Gallia moraretur fugans> pugiones*, etc., removing the words not in italics from lower down, while the L. of *L. Cinna* is probably a misreading of Ζ(ή)ται. Notes et Discussions: A. Diès, *Quelques études récentes sur les lettres de Platon*, tabulates views on authenticity 1864-1932, and discusses several passages; suggests ἐνεδίδον at 325d.

LXII 1. (January, 1936.)

L. Mariès, *Strophes et poèmes dans les Sibyllins*, finds that *Orac. Sibyll.* III 218-294 is written in stanzas indicated by repetitions and responsions in imitation of the Hebrew prophets; annotates the lines. P. Boyancé, *A propos de l'Art poétique d'Horace*, argues that for Neoptolemos ποίημα was (a) the faculty of poetic expression, λέξις, (b) the verses or complete short poems this could produce, while ποιήσις was (a) the faculty of conceiving the ὑπόθεσις of a big work, (b) such a work. Since there can be ποίημα (b) without ποιήσις (a), but no ποιήσις (b) without ποίημα (a), ποίημα is logically earlier (πρωτεύει, Philod. XII 26); hence the order of N.'s division is always given as ποίημα, ποιήσις, ποιήτης. This order may be found in Horace, where 46-118 deal with λέξις, 119-201 with ὑπόθεσις. In this part of the *A.P.* Horace may be freely embroidering N.'s canvas. J. E. Harry, 'Υφείρπε γὰρ πολὺ (*Soph. O.T.* 786): not 'the rumour spread abroad', but 'the taunt kept recurring to me strongly' (πολύ

nom.)
Droit
rômis

L
J
sixth-s
fourth
Altava
exister
Herac
Thasos
mission
p. 81)
Thessa
Paros.
Guard
Porcelli

LX
T.

his mar
3. Tyrt
on Aen
exampl
Anecdote
d'Agamē
means l
στήλη b
hero, wh
it as co
les Lois
Venet. r
180, Ric
reading
a new in
Discussi
discusses
Kriegssch

Rhe

1. E
Arminius
Gens Arm
no paralle
Arminius
connexio
show that
2. K
X's Sym
interpreta
partly ser
influence

nom.). Notes et Discussions: E. Stein on J. Pirenne's *Histoire des Institutions et du Droit privé de l'ancienne Égypte*, and E. Cavaignac on H. Rudolph's *Stadt und Staat im römischen Italien*.

LXII 2. (April, 1936.)

J. Carcopino, *Note sur une inscription chrétienne de Volubilis*: three inscriptions of sixth-seventh century A.D. show likenesses to inscriptions of Pomaria and Altava; a fourth, published in *Hesperis* 1923, is re-read by C. to refer in 679 A.D. to a lady *Altava koptativa* (i.e. *co-optativa*), and thus to prove active friendly relations still in existence. L. Robert, *Études d'épigraphie grecque*: Notes on (XL) inscriptions from Heraclea on Propontis, (XLI) decrees from Laodicea, (XLII) inscriptions from Thasos. (XLIII) New supplements by R. entirely change the sense of the manumission from Susa (Cumont, *Inscr. grecques de Suse*, p. 84). Another inscr. (*ibid.* p. 81) recognized as a manumission. (XLIV) An inscr. in Berlin recognized as a Thessalian manumission. (XLV) The solitary Gk. inscr. from Zara imported from Paros. Notes on (XLVI) decrees from Colophon (*AJP* 1935) and (XLVII) Guarducci's *Inscriptiones Creticae*. C. A. Forbes and M. S. Ginsburg, *Le Testamentum Porcelli*, give a commentary.

LXII 3. (July, 1936.)

T. W. Allen, *Adversaria III*. 1. Theognis will by his inspiration (σοφίζομεν) set his mark (σφρηγίς) on his verses (all, not some). 2. Banter of Theognis-separatists, 3. Tyr. 5. 3. ? ἤμισυ πᾶν θ'. 4. 'Longinus' 7. 2. ἀναθεώρημα for ἀνάθημα. 5-43. Notes on Aeneas Tacticus. 44. An Asiatic origin for Εἰλείθνια? (leg-pulling). 45. More examples (cf. *Rev. Phil.* 1935, p. 291) of ἀβλαβής active. 46. Corrections in Cramer's *Anecdota*. 47. Exx. of phonetic interchange of β and ν in MSS. P. Guillon, *La stèle d'Agamédès* (Paus. IX. 37. 7), tabulates Pausanias' use of στήλη and decides that he means by the word a commemorative slab, usually with inscription or relief. The στήλη by Agamedes' βόθρος was perhaps originally a κολοσσός in substitution for the hero, whose body could not be recovered from Hyrieus' man-trap. P. would regard it as commemorative. E. des Places, *Les manuscrits dérivés du 'Platon du Vatican' pour les Lois et l'Epinomis*, describes Corpus Christi Ox. 96, Venet. *Aḡp. Cl.* XI. 3 (= 973), Venet. 188 (= 1022), 187 (= 742), 184 (= 326), Laur. 80. 17, 59. 1, 85. 9. *com. sophr.* 180, *Riccard.* 67 and 84. J. Vanseveren, *Inscription d'Ilion* (Michel, *Recueil* 731): new reading and commentary. J. Le Gall, *L'itinéraire de Genséric*, argues, with the aid of a new inscription from Altava, for the land-route by the defile of Taza. Notes et Discussions: L. Robert on Merritt and West's *The Athenian Assessment of 425 B.C.*, discusses the geography of Caria; E. Bickermann severely criticizes W. Kolbe's *Die Kriegsschuldfrage von 218*.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. LXXXIV. 1.

1. E. Bickel, *Der Sohn des Sigimer, der Befreier Germaniens, sein Römername, Arminius und der Siegfriedmythus*. The name *Arminius* was taken from the old Roman *Gens Arminia*: it cannot have a 'germanistisches Etymon,' for then there would be no parallel for such a name either as *gentilicium* or as *cognomen*. The native name of Arminius may have been of the same root as Sigimer, Segestes, Segimund. But his connexion with the Siegfried of saga is unprovable. R. Meissner appends a note to show that there is no evidence for the derivation of *Arminius* from a German root.

2. K. von Fritz, *Antisthenes und Sokrates in Xenophons Symposion*. Criticisms of X.'s Symposium based on its relation to Plato are mistaken. The difficulties of interpretation can only be met by understanding that the work is partly playful, partly serious—παῖδα σπονδῇ λεληθνία μεμυγμένα. Some speculations about Aeschines' influence on Xenophon.

3. A. Klotz, *Die Quellen Plutarchs in der Lebensbeschreibung des Titus Quinctius Flamininus*. The Greek History comes chiefly from Polybius, the Roman History chiefly from Valerius Antias, supplemented from Livy and an occasional note from Cicero.

4. O. Immisch, *Der Epilog der nikomachischen Ethik*. Analysis of the Epilogue, and discussion of its relation to the *Politics*; with special reference to the polemic against Isocrates.

5. E. Reitzenstein, *Das neue Kunstwollen in den Amores Ovids*. The view, at considerable length and in some detail, that Ovid is much less serious and more impersonal than his predecessors in his treatment of love.

6. H. Wempe, *Die literarischen Beziehungen und das chronologische Verhältnis zwischen Germanicus und Manilius*. A new argument for the priority of Germanicus.

LXXXIV. 2.

1. E. Schwyzer, *Zur Bronze von Agnone*. Learned discussion of the inscription, with some new interpretations.

2. F. Hampl, *Oi Bottiaioi*. The relation of Spartolos to other cities in Bottike.

3. A. Klotz, *Ueber die Quelle Plutarchs in der Lebensbeschreibung des Q. Fabius Maximus*. The sole source was Valerius Antias (not Coelius Antipater). Livy was not used.

4. Ph. Merlan, *Ein Simplicios-Zitat bei Pseudo-Alexandros, und ein Plotinos-Zitat bei Simplicios*. A note on the relation of (a) *Simpl. ad. Ar., de Caelo* II. 1. 284a 14 sqq. to Pseudo-Alex. *ad Ar., Metaph.* A 8, 1074a sqq. (b) *Simpl. ibid.* to Plotinus, *Enn.* II. 1. init. Conclusions about the nature and date of Pseudo-Alex.'s work.

5. W. Süss, *Zur Cistellaria des Plautus*. Detailed investigation of the relation of the *Cistellaria* to Menander's *Synaristosai*.

6. R. Thurneysen, *Treveri*. The derivation of the name: it means 'those who cross the river.'

LXXXIV. 3.

1. G. Jachmann, *Eine Elegie des Propertius: ein Ueberlieferungsschicksal*. Prop. II. xv 25-8, 37-40 are declared interpolations on surprising grounds: then follows some unconvincing theorizing about interpolation in other Latin authors, esp. Vergil (*Aeneid*), Cicero (*de Off.*) and Val. Flacc. Enormous conclusions are based on meagre evidence.

2. J. Geffcken, *Zwei Sokratesworte*. Notes on (1) *θεία μοίρα* and (2) *ἀμαθία* as the Greatest Evil: both are originally genuine Socratic conceptions.

3. A. Wilhelm, *Diodoros XIX 45*. (1) W. suggests *ἐκκλίσεις* for the unintelligible *ἐγκλίσεις*. (2) L. and S.⁹ are mistaken in quoting *I.G.* IX 1, 692, 14 in support of the meaning 'drainage-conduit' for *ὀβέλισκοι* here: in any case *ὀβ.* in this passage does not mean 'drainage-conduit'; it means the *bars of railings* set in breaches of the city-wall, through which rain-water was drained. In Diodoros, these vents are blocked by earth dislodged in the storm; hence the flood. W. proves his point by reference to the 'Eumenian' city-wall of Pergamum, where sockets for such railings can still be seen in the vents. (3) XIX 45, 6 W. suggests *ἅπας τόπος* for *ἐκαστος*. (4) XIX 45, 7 *εὐτυχημάτων* for *ἀτυχημάτων*.

4. H. Dahlmann, *Caesars Schrift über die Analogie*. Caesar's 'analogistic' theory of style, the reformed *elegantia*, the *locutio emendata et Latina* at which he aimed, was to be founded on the *sermo cotidianus*, not on an artificial literary dialect. Certain laws are inherent in *sermo cotidianus*: these must be so observed that anomalies must be expelled and analogous words and forms created; e.g. *mortus* must replace *mortuus*. The well-known fragment *tanquam scopulum sic fugias inauditum atque insolens verbum* must be understood in the light of this: the Analogist was bound to

and in fact did invent new words and forms, such as *ens*, *marmura*, *turbonis* etc.; but he had to base them on a consistent theory of what the *sermo cotidianus* could admit by analogy; Caesar's condemnation is reserved for *Neubildungen* which do not fulfil this condition.

D. decides that the date of the work was either 55 or 54 B.C.; that it was a work of rhetoric, not of grammar; and that it was inspired by C.'s tutor Antonius Gniphio. He discusses in some detail C.'s *rationes analogiae*, and the arrangement and contents of the dissertation.

5. A. H. Krappe, *Hermione*. H. was an Earth-Goddess, equated with Demeter after the Olympian invasion; the centre of her cult was the Argive city of the same name. K. accepts the identification of Hermione with Harmonia (surely *identification* is the wrong word and idea? One may have influenced the other, but they are certainly not the same. The article is obscure on this point). He infers that the marriage of Harmonia and Kadmos is an *Umbildung* of an earlier marriage of Hermione and Hermes; and discusses the nature and history of Harmonia as a chthonic goddess.

LXXXIV. 4.

1. *Sprachwissenschaftliche Beiträge zur frührheinischen Siedlungs- und Kulturgeschichte*, I. L. Weisgerber. Examination of personal names on inscriptions in district of Treveri. Maps to show distribution within Civ. Trev. of (1) 'Roman' names, (2) Celtic names, (3) other names (Germanic, Illyrian, Ligurian): interesting conclusions drawn from distribution of these other names outside Civ. Trev. Much valuable discussion of details.

2. *Zu Plotins Interpretation von Platons Timaeus 35A*. H. R. Schwyzer. What antiquity understood by *περὶ τὰ σώματα γιγνομένη μεριστή οὐσία*.

3. *Plutarchstudien*. K. Ziegler. Reasons for some readings of his text of *Alexander*; some new suggestions; and proof that *Alexander* is incomplete.

4. *Die Schlacht bei Munda*. A. Schulten. Explanation and reconciliation of some variations in the sources. Description of the tactics and of the site.

LXXXV. 1.

1. *Sophoclea*. L. Radermacher. *ἐνθηρος* = *ἐν ᾧ θῆρ ἔστι*, and is not metaphorical. Phil. 719 sq. read *παλινβίη* for *πᾶσιν θείη*. Phil. 1219 *σοι=τοι*, unique survival in Attic. *κρύπτειν ἐξ ὁδοῦ*, abbreviated phrase illustrated. *σμικρός* and *μικρός* discussed; both together on inscription of fifth century B.C.

2. *Zur Frage der Properzinterpolation*. U. Knoche. Prop. IV. 5. 55-8 and III. 22. 37-8 are interpolations. Case not as conclusive as K. thinks: but he has several interesting discussions and observations, e.g. on repetition of verses in Greek and Latin poets of different ages and styles, and the unique use of *lyra* in IV. 5. 58.

3. *Zu einigen oskischen Götternamen*. A. v. Blumenthal. An appendix to E. Schwyzer's excellent article on the bronze of Agnone in LXXXIV. 2.

4. *Ueber die Stellung des Cassius Dio unter den Quellen zur Geschichte des zweiten punischen Krieges: eine Vorarbeit zur Quellenanalyse der dritten Dekade des Livius*. A. Klotz. The influence of Coelius Antipater on Livy and on Dio *ap.* Zonaras. Dio used Antias also. He has preserved much detail omitted by Livy.

LXXXV. 2.

1. Conclusion of A. Klotz's article in LXXXV. 1 on the sources of Cassius Dio. More quotations to show that Dio combines two sources of tradition—Coelius Antipater and Val. Antias. Direct influence of Livy's Third Decade or of Polybius nowhere provable in Dio. Coelius was the principal source, Antias secondary.

2. *Die Alkestissage*. L. Weber. Speculations about the place of Artemis, Apollo, Herakles etc. in the story: comparison of Orpheus and Eurydike. An extremely obscure and formless article, from which it is difficult to extract any clear conclusions.

3. *Ein Bruchstück aus einem historischen Roman*. F. Zimmermann. Ingenious restoration and elucidation of *P. Oxy.* 1826. The Verso fragment must precede the Recto. Rattenbury's doubts whether this papyrus has anything to do with romance were unjustified. The fragment is concerned with a quarrel between King Sesonchosis and his son.

4. *Theseus der Ionier*. H. Herter. Chiefly about the συννοικισμός, which (1) means political unity of towns in Attica, not centralization of Attic people in Athens, (2) must have been a very slow and gradual undertaking, (3) was certainly not carried out without opposition from some towns. Connexion of Theseus with Marathon maintained.

5. MISZELLE: *βωρία*. L. Radermacher. *βωρία* means 'ploughed land.'

LXXXV. 3.

1. *Theseus der Ionier*. H. Herter (continued). Aphidnai the original seat of Theseus in Attica. Place of Trozen in the saga: it was an old Ionic settlement which originally shared Theseus with N.-E. Attica, and was always remembered as his birthplace. Identification of Poseidon and Aegeus denied. Myth and History in the Cretan story—Minotaur, Labyrinth, Athenian Tribute, Ariadne. Theseus and the Amazons and Centaurs. His original connexion with Thessaly proved, and supported by legend of burial at Skyros. His name is not pre-hellenic.

2. *Die Namen des Sprichworts in den klassischen Sprachen*. L. Bieler. (1) Accepts ancient derivation of *παροιμία* from *παρὰ* and *οἶμος* and interprets as originally being advice given e.g. by father to son 'to accompany his way,' to go with him on his journey. *παροιμία* is properly adjective, sc. γνώμη. (2) *Proverbium. verbum pro verbo reddere* = render literally: pro verbo = literally: a proverbium is an utterance that must be taken literally, i.e. obeyed or followed. Note on *praetor*: it means 'Vorsprecher,' from the well-known use of *praetor*.

3. *Textkritische Beiträge zur Ciris*. R. Helm. Emendations and elucidations of vv. 5, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14-5, 31, 47, 48, 54-7, 70 sqq., 90, 116 sqq. (*prōterve* is a curious suggestion), 138 sqq., 149 sq., 158 sq., 160 sq., 185 sqq., 217 sqq., 227 sq., 249 sqq., 265 sq., 287 sq., 293, 297-327, 349 sqq., 374, 383 sqq., 386, 408 sq., 413 sqq., 434, 436, 443 sqq., 484, 531, and the Journey.

Rivista di Filologia. N.S. XII (1934), 3.

A. Rostagni, *Le nuove ΔΙΗΓΗΣΕΙΣ e l'ordinamento dei carmi di Callimaco*. Of scant merit in itself, this prose epitome enables one to reconstruct the order of the poems adopted in ancient editions. In the trochaic poem with invocation of Artemis coming after the *Ἰαμβοί* we may identify the series of trochaic pentameters in *P. Oxy.* 1011. Remarks about the character of the *Ἰαμβοί* and of the *Μέλη*. The papyrus edition presupposed by this epitome was not very different from the codex to which *P. Oxy.* 1011 belonged. A. Momigliano, *Manto e l'oracolo di Apollo Clario*. At Claros oracles were certainly delivered by a priest, cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* II, 54. None the less there is evidence for the use of a tripod, as at Delphi. This importation (along with a priestess?) is reflected in the legend of the coming of Manto, daughter of Teiresias, to Claros. M. Guarducchi, *Nuovi contributi alla cronologia degli archonti beotici*. In continuation of her studies on this topic the authoress examines a series of Boeotian federal archons of the last quarter of the third century B.C., amplifies the list of Holleaux (*Rev. ét. gr.*, 1895, 183 ff.; 1900, 187 ff.) and attempts some closer datings. C. Gallavotti, *L'edizione teocritea di Moscopulo*. G. enquires which of our codices show

in their
Moscho
Cesare
have re
La dist
delimit
passing
(Histor
appear
Rhauc
exact d
that th
Attalus
Enni n

N.

M.

essay u
L' asin
Eastern
Paralle
Archilo
origin c
animal
Argona
greater
reason
over 5
referen
reign (A.
A. Mon
είρήνη
the Per
Sanctis
συμπα
of 371
especia
former
is the

1934, 3
third o
as its c
a divis
with A
Atheni
papyru
mann.
votive
birth-p
pino (A
This d
positio
Cinna
The ye

in their text traces of the activity of Byzantine scholars and assesses the work of Moschopoulos. E. Bolaffi, *Note al testo del I libro dei 'Commentarii belli Gallici' di Cesare*. B. vindicates a large number of passages which Meusel and other scholars have rejected or altered in too arbitrary a fashion. *Miscellanea*: I. G. De Sanctis, *La distruzione di Rhaukos*. The stele from Gortyn (Collitz-Blass 5016) attesting a delimitation of territory between Gortyn and Cnossos with a line of demarcation passing right through the middle of another city has been brought by M. Guarducchi (*Historia VIII*, 1934, 73 ff.) into connection with Polybius, XXX, 23. It would appear that the pact was concluded before and not after the actual destruction of Rhaukos. Fr. Della Corte, *L'ambasceria di Cratete a Roma*. Difficulties about the exact date at which this eminent Stoic came to Rome can be avoided by supposing that the Attalus of Pergamum who despatched him was not Attalus III but Attalus II, co-regent with Eumenes II. A date c. 171 fits Suetonius—'sub ipsam Ennii mortem.' *Recensioni. Note bibliografiche. Pubblicazioni ricevute.*

N.S. XII (1934), 4.

M. Lenchantin, *Sul preteso sincretismo dei generi nella letteratura latina*. A general essay upon the topic of the literary characteristics of Virgil and Horace. S. Luria, *L'asino nella pelle del leone (Un parallelo fra le favole dell'India e quelle dell'antica Grecia)*. Eastern parallels to Aesopic and other fables, however close, do not prove derivation. Parallels to Aesop, 333 and 336. L. discusses in detail the fable of the monkey in Archilochus, attacking the views of Immisch (*Philologus LXXXV*, 1929, 1 ff.). The origin of some stories about the donkey is to be found in the rôle assigned to that animal in phallic and Dionysiac ceremonies. K. Scott, *La data di composizione della Argonautica di Valerio Flacco*. S. argues that the introduction (I, 1-21), if not the greater part, of the *Argonautica* was composed in the reign of Domitian. There is no reason to believe, as many have, that the poem was begun soon after A.D. 70; moreover 5 f., 'ille tibi cultusque deum delubraque gentis | instituet,' is presumably a reference to the building of the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* by Domitian, late in his reign (a theory anticipated in *C.Q.*, 1929, 121 ff., which is not noticed by S.). A. Momigliano, *La κοινή εἰρήνη del 386 al 338 a.c.* M. discusses the meaning of *κοινή εἰρήνη*, with its connotation of 'sanctions,' and examines carefully such pacts from the Peace of Antalcidas to the arrangements made after Chaeronea. Against De Sanctis (*Rivista*, 1934, 145 ff.) he holds that the Peace of 362/1 was supplemented by a *συμμαχία*; the inscription *S.I.G.*³ 182 does not, however, refer to this but to the Peace of 371/0. The *κοινή εἰρήνη* and the *συμμαχία* of 338 were separate instruments (cf. especially Arrian, *Anabasis III*, 24, 5; Justin, IX, 5), and *S.I.G.*³ 260 reproduces the former. G. De Sanctis, *Epigraphica*: XII. *Il regolamento militare dei Macedoni*. This is the inscription found near Amphipolis and published by P. Roussel (*Rev. arch.*, 1934, 39 ff.). Discipline and penalties. On the lettering, to be dated late in the third or early in the second century B.C.—hence interesting possibilities of Philip V as its originator. S. Accame, *La diarchia dei Molossi*. A. traces the development of a division of power in the royal family in the fourth and third centuries, beginning with Alcetas and his son, who are mentioned together on the inscription of the Second Athenian League in 375. G. Bonfante, *L'accento beotico*. An examination of the papyrus fragments of Corinna, with criticism of the views of Wilamowitz and Hermann. *Miscellanea*: I. C. Marinatos, *Scavi nella Grotta di Arkalochori*. A find of votive axes of gold and silver in a cave some twenty miles south of Candia: the birth-place of Zeus? II. G. De Sanctis, *La data della nascita di G. Cesare*. Carcopino (*Mélanges Bidez*, Brussels, 1934, 355 ff.) has argued ingeniously for the year 101. This does not really suit Suetonius, *Divus Julius* I. Caesar's designation to the position of *flamen dialis* in 84, repudiation of his betrothed Cossutia and marriage to Cinna's daughter, closely connected transactions, need not have taken a long time. The year 100 is to be preferred. *Recensioni. Note bibliografiche. Pubblicazioni ricevute.*

N.S. XIII (1935), 1.

C. Kerényi, *Sofrone ovvero il naturalismo greco*. A discussion of the character of Sophron's work in the light of the newly-discovered papyrus fragments. The first of these, from the mime Ταὶ γυναῖκες αἱ τὰν θεὸν φαντὶ ἐξελαῖν, describes a magical ceremony in vivid and ritually exact language. Realism also in fr. 2, from the Ἀκίστρια. Sophron must not be regarded as a comic poet—his delineation of human life is the natural complement to an idealistic view of the universe. A. Rostagni, *La 'Vita' suetoniana di Tibullo e la costituzione del 'Corpus Tibullianum'*. The brief, corrupt and generally despised *Vita* attached to Bk. III of the *Corpus Tib.* is to be held for Suetonian. For 'Albius Tibullus, eques †regalis†' read '<A.> Albius Tibullus eques R. e Gabiis': the insertion of the praenomen was suggested by an early Dutch editor, 'e Gabiis' by Bährens. For Gabii, in the regio Pedana, cf. Horace, *Epp.* I, 4, 2. The corruption in 'ante alios Corvinum Messalam †originem† dilexit' perhaps derives from something like 'or(atorem) insigniter.' The *Vita* attributes to Tibullus the composition of 'epistolae amatoriae': these are to be identified with III, 8-20, and are authentic, so R. holds, as contrasted with 1-6 (Lygdamus and Neaera) and 7 (*Panegyricus Messallae*). G. De Sanctis, *Epigraphica* XIII: *La τάξις φόρον del 425 a. C.* An examination of l. 34 of this inscr. (*IG* I², 63 = Tod, 66). The prytany—tribe should be Αἰγῆς, not Οἰνῆς. In the crucial phrase about a στρατιά read ἐπειδὴν ἔκει ἐ] στρα[τιά]. This must refer to the expected return of Cleon from Sphacteria. The first decree of Thudippus is thus a gamble on the future. Valuable conclusions about the chronology of this year. V. Bertoldi, *Spigolature da Teofrasto*. The words ἀφία and 'apium,' though applied to different plants, are ultimately derived from the same root, the ancient word for 'water,' cf. the Thraco-Illyrian 'apa.' Σφένδαμνος (*acer Creticus*) is not to be connected with the verb σφαδαίνειν. It has alternative forms, Byzantine ἀσφένδαμνος, Modern Greek ἀσπένδαμος. A pre-Greek word, cf. δίκταμνος, the Cretan plant *par excellence*. *Miscellanea*: I. E. Lobel, *La 'Giustizia' di Euforione*. Some conjectures about this papyrus fragment (*Ann. della R. Scuola Norm. Sup. di Pisa* IV, 1935). II. F. Della Corte, *Per l'identità di Valerio Edittuo con Valerio Sorano*. The lyric poet Valerius Aedituus (Gellius, 19, 9, 3; Apuleius, *Apol.* 9) is to be identified with Q. Valerius Soranus, the scholarly author of the Ἑποπτιδές. III. G. De Sanctis, *La prima spedizione ateniese nell'Occidente*. The treaty between Athens and Egesta in 454/3 (*IG* I², 19 = Tod, 31) is presumably earlier than the great disaster in Egypt, which De Sanctis dates in 453/2. To the same year as the treaty with Egesta is probably to be dated the visit of the Athenian general Diotimus to Naples (Timaeus, fr. 99m). IV. G. De Sanctis, *Polibio e le relazioni tra Roma e i Rodii*. The well-known crux in P.'s remarks about Rhodes under the year 168/7 (30, 5, 6), ὡς σχεδὸν ἔτη τετταράκοντα πρὸς τοῖς ἑκατὸν κεκοινωνηκὼς ὁ δῆμος Ῥωμαίοις τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων καὶ καλλίστων ἔργων, invites emendation, for an alliance with Rome c. 306 B.C. cannot be accepted. The proposals of Holleaux and Carcopino are not very plausible. Has something dropped out—Ἑλλησὶ τε καὶ before Ῥωμαίοις? V. S. Accame, *L' alleanza di Atene con Leontini e Reggio*. With reference to the inscr. recording these alliances in 433/2 (*IG* I², 52, 51 = Tod, 57-8) Accame doubts whether, as a matter of fact, the erasure on the stele of the treaty with Leontini was an earlier treaty (? of 446-40, as Hiller v. Gärtringen argued). None the less the existence of an earlier treaty with Leontini is attested (Thuc. III, 86): and it would be reasonable to suppose that such a treaty, and, naturally, an alliance with Rhegium as well, was concluded in 454/3, cf. the case of Egesta, *IG* I², 19 = Tod, 31. VI. M. Lenchantin, *La data del bimillenario d' Orazio e d' Augusto*. This date should be 1936, not 1935. The common error, also made in the computation of the Virgilian anniversary, comes from treating the years before Christ as cardinals instead of as ordinals.

N.S. XIII (1935), 2.

R. Mondolfo, *La genesi e i problemi della cosmologia di Talete*. Thales was a φυσιολόγος, not a metaphysician. Egyptian influence upon Thales; eastern myths about cosmic conflicts; the Greek myth about Oceanos; Thales on flux and reflux. M. Lenchantin, *Callimaco, l'acqua Filetea e Properzio* III 3. A discussion of P.'s debt to Callimachus as illustrated by this poem. For Hippocrene, cf. *P. Oxy.* 1011, 85; fr. 388 Schn. The Muse also sprinkles P. with water from another spring, Aganippe, described as 'aqua Philetaea,' for the scholarly Coan was a poet of love (he celebrated Bittis in his verses). A. Momigliano, *La Storia di Ephoro e le Elleniche di Teopompo*. An examination of various passages of Plutarch, *Vita Alcibiadis*, shows that Theopompus in his *Hellenica* followed Xenophon and Ephorus, contaminating them. The *Hellenica* were probably published between 346 and 343: this gives a date for the publication of that part of Ephorus (I-XIX?) which dealt with Greek history down to 394. This view is confirmed by certain indications in Ephorus, e.g. fr. 119=Strabo IX, 400 f., and Diodorus XI, 82. M. disentangles a leading thought in Ephorus, a preoccupation with the moral qualities that won the hegemony for Athens, Sparta and Thebes in turn. Likewise the ἀπερή of Philip was emphasized in the later books of Ephorus, published after an interval. G. De Sanctis, *Epigraphica*: XIV. *Contributi epigraphici alla cronologia della guerra deceleica*. The decree in honour of Archelaus (*IG* I², 105= Tod 91) has recently been transferred by Meritt from 411/0 to 407/6. The new date depends upon the view of Ferguson that there were no tribal prytanies during the rule of the Five Thousand. But this theory is unproven, and historical grounds speak for 411/0. For the same reason another inscription (*IG* I², 501) can be assigned to the same year. M. Segre, *Epigraphica*: I. *Catalogo di libri da Rodi*. II. *Ἐρρεγγοποιημένοι*. This important inscription, published by Maiuri in 1925, has been examined by S., who provides a photograph and some improvements. It is the catalogue of the library of a gymnasium, not a list of donations. In the second study S. examines the word στεγνόποια which occurs on the Macedonian military inscr. from Philippi (G. De Sanctis, *Riv.* 1934, 505 ff.). The verb was already known from a Pergamene inscr., *Inscr. von Perg.* 158. The phrase μέτω ἔρρεγγοποιημένων of that inscr. means 'men who have not yet been in winter-quarters. Supplements of 15 f. S. Peppinck, *De duobus Dionysii Antiquitatum codicibus Vaticanis*. These are 133 and 134, which scholars have unduly neglected—to their loss. G. Bonfante, *L' accusativo Dorico TY ('te') e l' osco tiom*. An accusative form the same as the nominative occurs in certain Indo-European languages. The Oscan 'tiom' is probably of this kind—a characteristic which differentiates Osco-Umbrian from Latin. *Miscellanea*: I. B. Lavagnini, *Areologia in Terenzio* (*Adelfi*, v. 536). The phrase 'virtutes narro' means 'act as an aretalogus.' II. F. Della Corte, *Marco Seio Nicanore, grammatico e poeta*. The poet Sueius mentioned by Macrobius was probably Seius, as Ribbeck saw: to be identified with the freedman of M. Seius in Varro (fr. 47, B.), and with the M. Seius Nicanor of Suetonius, *De gram.* 6. III. C. A. Balducci, *L' opposizione dinastico-politica alla morte di Onorio*. On the policy of the Western Emperor Johannes (423-5): B. argues that he is the same man as the 'primicerius notariorum' attested in the year 408.

Wiener Studien. LIII. 1935 (published December, 1935).

[The majority of the contributions are dedicated to Ernst Kalinka on the occasion of his seventieth birthday.]

ABHANDLUNGEN: E. Löw, *Das Verhältnis von Logik und Leben bei Parmenides*, analyses and explains the extant fragments, which are sufficient to show how Parmenides answered all questions of primary importance and to account for his opposi-

tion to Heraclitus. A. Lesky, *Zum Orestes des Euripides*, first comments on the general structure of the play, then discusses briefly the problems raised by vv. 1225-45 and the conclusion. K. Glaser, *Gang und Ergebnis des Platonischen Lysis*, examines the *Lysis* with a view to showing why *φιλία* and *ἔρως* form such an important theme in Plato's philosophy. J. Jüthner, *Zur Geschichte der griechischen Wettkämpfe*, discusses and re-interprets allusions to Greek athletics in Pindar *Nem.* 5, 19; Aristotle *περὶ πορείας ζώων* 3, 705 a 16; Pollux *Onomasticon* 3, 151; Philostratus *Imag.* 1, 24 (328, 17 Kayser); Themistius on Aristotle *Phys.* 5, 3, 226 b 31 (172, 26 ff. Schenkl); and Aristeides XIII *Panath.* I 318 (Dindorf). L. Radermacher, *Sulcius acer et Caprius*, at Horace *Sat.* I 4 defends Sulcius against Sulgus which is supported by inscriptions. Delator = *συκοφάντης*; as Caprius suggests *caprificus* so Sulcius suggests *ficus sulca*, and as Caprius suggests *caper*, so Sulcius suggests *sulcus* = *membrum muliebre*. L. Bieler, *Kritisch-Exegetisches zur Suasoria De Alexandro des Avellius Fuscus* submits an improved text and comments on the elements of legend and religion which are part of the Asiatic school of rhetoric. He compares *Controv.* I 3. K. J. Heilig, *Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Mediceus II des Tacitus*, shows that Paulinus Venetus (1280-1344 A.D.) knew the later books of the *Annals* and that he derived his knowledge directly from Mediceus II. M. Schuster, *Kritische Nachlese zur Briefsammlung des jüngeren Plinius*, discusses some passages to illustrate and defend his choice of readings in the Teubner edition. K. Jax, *Zum Indiculus des Possidius*, shows that though Possidius himself was unsystematic, Kalinka's examination of Cod. Veronensis XXII 20 proves that Migne is quite unreliable.

MISZELLEN: E. v. Ivánka derives the conception of Πενία in Aristot. *Probl.* XXVIII 4 from the Cynic poet Crates of Thebes. F. Miltner attributes an inscribed Greek epigram found near Konya to the third century A.D. B. Warnecke supplements by another example Drexler's list of stories reminiscent of the Midas legend (Roscher 2966 ff.). H. Lackenbacher comments on some of the difficulties in Catullus 36. M. Schuster seeks to elucidate the hitherto unexplained moon miracles in Livy XXII, 1, 9-12. L. Radermacher at Quintilian VII, 1, 7 expunges *de facto ambigitur* as a gloss. E. Hauler corrects and supplements on the strength of the Ambrosian palimpsest the text of Fronto *Ep.* XVIII (p. 185. 16 ff. Naber). K. Prinz shows that Boethius's occasional lapses in prose from classical idiom are balanced in verse by metrical irregularities, particularly *prōprius*. J. Brück argues that *corylus* in classical Latin, even Virg. *Georg.* 2, 65, means the tree, not the nut, which is *nux abellana*. *Corylus* = *nut* is only a passing phase in later Latin.

Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung. 62. Band. 3./4. Heft.

The classical languages have only a small part in this number. E. Schwyzler discusses the form *ἐᾶ* in Il. V. 256. He believes the true form to be *ἐα*, an ancient present. E. Specht discusses the form *χαλίφρων*. V. Pisani compares *βλωθρός* with Tocharish *mrāc*, 'head.' E. Fraenkel argues that the form *ἐγραψε* in Coll. 4991 XI 20 of the Gortyn inscription is active, and he compares a Bulgarian expression. He also offers an explanation of the form *λάγαρον*. D. Westermann criticizes an article by H. Sköld (Vol. LIX 205 ff.) in which he professed to find parallels in sound development between Greek and certain languages spoken in the Sudan. Brief notes on single Greek words are contributed by E. Schwyzler and F. Specht. The latter has an interesting article on the expression 'propere ocus' in Plautus *Cist.* 638. He believes it to be an ancient construction, paralleled in Sanskrit, *propere* being an ablative and *ocus* comparative. Specht also briefly discusses the development of the meaning of Latin *pons*, which he refers to the Terramare dwellings when 'way' equalled 'bridge.' He compares Herodotus' description of Paeonian lake-dwellings (V. 16). F. Mezger discusses at length the forms Gothic *sōkeis* and Latin *sāgis*. G. Bonfante attempts to prove a rule that final short *i* in Latin disappears in polysyllables

but rem
Vedic g
Gneiss,
upon th
Englis
also co
languag
and labi
contrib
form du
W. Sch
prehisto
tures in
Europe
article o
with cer
mann di

63.

In
with th
Formati
μεμβράιν
which
G. Ana
originate
tion, in
criticise
(*Glotta* 2
the form
entitled
He tabu
of these
dealing
writes o
rogeinn.
and the
follows
the form
tions ba
Short no

Ind

V. M
not all)
E. Herm
tile; mōt
physical
E. Schw
R. Bluer

but remains in dissyllables. W. Wust contributes a note comparing Latin *bimus* with Vedic *çatāhima-*. E. Schwyzer discusses the antecedents of the Swiss-German form *Gneiss*, and F. Specht at some length West Germanic *felte*. The latter also writes upon the original I.-E. lengthening of *u* + consonant in connection with the Old English form *scrūd*, and continues his discussion of various Lithuanian forms. He also contributes a long article on the relationship of the Baltic and Slavonic languages. H. Oertel writes at length upon the usage of the Sanskrit verbs *vap* + *nis* and *labh* + *ā* with divine names. Specht writes upon Sanskrit *caniṣṭhat*. E. Lewy contributes notes on Ossetish forms. Schwyzer discusses the history of the Spanish form *dureta*. R. Thurneysen writes shortly on the etymology of Old Irish *dōid*. W. Schultz has an interesting article on the Indo-European question as it concerns prehistory. He discusses the movements of peoples and the spread of various cultures in the fourth millennium B.C. F. Specht writes on the origin of the Indo-European form for 'harrow,' which he traces to the Ligurians. He also has a long article on the development of certain Indo-European *i*-suffixes. W. Krogmann deals with certain cognates of the Indo-European stem **peisgo-*, **pisgo-*, 'fish.' E. Hermann discusses the vocative singular of *ā*-stems.

63. Band. 1./2. Heft.

In a note on *Gk. ὄμος* W. Schulze compares the vowel quantity and meaning with that of *Skt. bhāsada-*. E. Schwyzer contributes a long article on Greek Noun Formation, illustrating it with a detailed examination of three examples, *ἐπεμὼν*, *μεμψάεινος* and Homeric *πιδήσσα*. F. Specht writes a note on the form *ποταμός* which he derives from **ποταμνός*. He compares Anglo-Saxon related forms. G. Anagnostopulos in an interesting comment on the suffix *-eus* suggests that it originated, not by borrowing from an unknown pre-Greek language, but in contraction, in the same way as the suffix *-ās*, or post-classical *-is* for *-ios*. W. Krogmann criticises M. Runes' interpretation of the form *einom* in the Duenos inscription (*Glotta* XXI 125 ff.) and suggests that its meaning is 'going'. He derives from it the forms *festinus* and *opinari* (through **opinus*). W. Hart contributes a long article entitled 'Die überkurzen Vokale in den historischen indogermanischen Sprachen'. He tabulates the material by languages, and draws conclusions as to the development of these vowels. F. Specht continues his examination of various Lithuanian forms, dealing with the inflexion of I.E. *ē*-stems and of the dative singular. E. Fraenkel writes on the Lithuanian imperfect. R. Thurneysen examines the Old Irish form *rogeinn*. A. Johannson compares and contrasts the Germanic proper name Ardaricus and the Iranian Ardabures. R. Loewe writes on the origin of the word *gas* and follows L. Nagel in connecting it with German *gäschen*. O. Grünenthal examines the forms of the perfect tense in the Slavonic languages and makes certain suggestions based upon them with regard to tense formation in original Indo-European. Short notes are contributed by F. Specht, K. Bouda, W. Schulze and O. Grünenthal.

LANGUAGE.

Indogermanische Forschungen. LIII (1935), 2.

V. Machek adds further examples of the palatalization of I.Eu. *k* in certain (but not all) of the satem languages when standing before liquids or back vowels. E. Hermann discusses I.Eu. terms of family-relationship (**atīa*, familiar and infantile; *mōtē* 'mother' in Lith.; terms for 'parents' usually based on more obvious physical fact of maternity; **sunus* 'son' late; so Lat. *liberi*; and some others). E. Schwentner calls attention to Hebbel's interest in Comparative Philology. R. Bluemel continues his papers on the acc. 'of reference,' replying to the criticisms

of Sommer and Biese. B. Rosenkranz discusses the East Italic insc. *P.I.D.* 343 and shows conclusively that it is not Etrusc. But he considers it pre-I.Eu., despite some 'Ligurian' (!) elements. Idem, the Lepontic inscc. are not Celtic; but 'Ligurian,' B. holds from an analysis of proper names, is only partly I.Eu., partly Japhetic. A. von Blumenthal collects the evidence for the several designations of *sun* current in Italic. E. Lewy traces the history of the non-I.Eu. word 'hemp.' E. Fraenkel: on the treatment of Slavonic loanwords in the E. Lith. dialect of Twerecz. Reviews.

LIII (1935), 3.

H. Lommel writes on the etymology and history of the Av. names *Naotara* and *Spitāma* with reference especially to the history and connexions of the persons who bore them. F. Brender: Lith. *kitóniškas*: *kitas* 'other' with secondary suffix. J. B. Hofmann delivers a well-founded and well-merited polemic against Pisani's fantastic etymological methods and results. *contaminare*: *tango*. H. stresses the importance of the total history of a word for all etymological inquiry. His article well shows the need of combining literary with linguistic study. A. Augstkalns: Lith. *mótė* 'mother' (a meaning commonly denied), perhaps a back-formation? N. van Wijk: on the prehistory of Slavonic aspects (not directly inherited from I.Eu.). Reviews.

LIII (1935), 4.

H. Dempe writes a valuable critique of Karl Bühler's 'Sprachtheorie.' L. R. Palmer discusses the nature of analogy in language, with special reference to late popular Greek (papyri), showing that analogy is not to be appealed to as a scapegoat, a mere mechanical device, but operates only under definite conditions of association. E. Koschmieder: a survey of recent discussions of the theory of aspects, supplemented by further consideration of Slavonic usage. Reviews. Indexes.

LIV (1936), 1.

E. and K. Zwirner write a long article on modern German accent studied by photometrical methods. E. Schwentner: Skt. *śvaka*- 'wolf' is the **śvaka*- 'dog' postulated for the O.P. *spaka*- (Hdt. 1. 110, *σπάκα*—the later *σπάξ* nom. is an invention of the grammarians). W. Brandenstein explains *ἄμβος*, *θρίαμβος*, *διθόραμβος* as Mycenaean Greek transmitted to later times through an 'Aegaeo-Tyrrhenian' medium; hence their phonetic peculiarities. They mean 'one-step, three-step, four-step' (*Ft*-, *τρι*-, *τέτορ*-). For *-αμβος* cf. Skt. *angam* 'limb'. Brandenstein's explanations of the phonetic difficulties involved are ingenious, if not altogether satisfying. V. Pisani discusses Frisk's paper (*I.F.* 52, 282 ff.) on compounds of the type of Gk. *ἀκρόπολις*. A. von Blumenthal on *saeculum*: an analysis of recent etymologies. W. Krogmann defends the authenticity of the Kehrlich fibula and explains its *wodini hailag* as 'blessed by Wodan' (*wodini* instrum.). A. Senn: distributive apposition in Lithuanian. E. Lewy: Lith. *dabaĩ* 'now'—cf. Germ. *tapfer* 'brave, bold'? For the variation in meaning cf. such pairs as Germ. *schön*: *schon*, *fest*: *fast*, Lat. *ferus*: *feve*. M. Nacinovich seeks to justify Postgate's account of the Latin fut. inf. in *-tūrum* (i.e. *-tū* + **erom*) as being due to dialect (Sabine) influence. Reviews.

D. 343 and
Eu., despite
Keltic; but
Eu., partly
gnations of
ord 'hemp.'
dialect of

Naotara and
persons who
suffix. J. B.
's fantastic
portance of
shows the
Lith. *môtė*
van Wijk:
Reviews,

ie.' L. R.
ence to late
as a scape-
nditions of
theory of
Reviews.

studied by
vaka- 'dog
s an inven-
θύραμβος as
'Cyrrenian'
three-step,
andenstein's
t altogether
unds of the
cent etymol-
nd explains
distributive
bfē 'brave,
n, fest : *fast*,
e Latin fut.
Reviews.